" 907.60	Carboxymethyl cellulose sodium salts of a purity not exceeding 98 percent nor less than 95 percent by weight on a dry weight basis (provided for in item 465.87, part 8A, schedule 4)	Free	No change	On or before the close of the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 1974.".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1974.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to suspend until the close of June 30, 1975, the duty on certain carboxymethyl cellulose salts."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out the matter appearing immediately after line 6 and insert the following:

"907.60	Carboxymethyl cellulose sodium salts of a purity not exceeding 98 percent nor less than 95 percent by weight on a dry weight basis (provided for in item 465.87, part 8A, schedule 4).	Free	No change	On or before 6/30/75.".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "January 1, 1974" and insert "the day after the date of the enactment of this Act".

Mr. MILLS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to suspend until the close of June 30, 1975, the duty on certain carboxymethyl cellulose salts."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the four bills just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROSPECT OF ANOTHER CRIPPLING NATIONWIDE TRUCKER STRIKE

(Mr. GUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the country now faces the possible prospect of another crippling nationwide strike by independent truckers, at a time when we are not yet fully recovered from the disastrous effects of the previous strike.

With another strike apparently scheduled by at least one segment of the independent truckers for May 13, I was therefore extremely disturbed to read in the newspaper this morning that the Federal Mediation Service has not yet made an effort to contact those threatening a shutdown and apparently has no plans to do so.

At the same time, little or no effective relief has been provided for the causes of the original nationwide strike, which resulted from the skyrocketing cost of diesel fuel and scarcity of supplies.

I have already introduced legislation to provide meaningful, immediate, and large-scale relief for the Nation's truckers by suspending for 6 months collection of the 4 cent a gallon Federal tax on diesel fuel, tied to a freeze at January 15, 1974, price levels.

However, in view of the prospect of another strike, I believe additional action is called for by the executive branch.

I am therefore introducing today a sense of the House resolution calling on the President to immediately inform the Congress of what steps he is taking or will take in an effort to avert another nationwide crisis similar to the strike which recently imperiled movement of the Nation's food supply and caused unknown economic damage.

I have a particular concern because of a statement attributed to Mr. Mike Parkhurst of Overdrive Magazine predicting that a new shutdown will "be tighter in some areas, like Florida" than in others.

But this is a problem that is hardly limited to my own State of Florida.

It threatens the economy of the entire Nation and all its citizens, and therefore deserves prompt attention by all of us.

FINANCING NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTIONS

(Mr. STARK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, this morning we received a letter from George Bush explaining, in response to efforts by a bipartisan committee to seek ways to finance national nominating conventions, that the Republican National Committee at a recent meeting passed the following resolution:

That the Republican National Committee go on record here and now as being strongly opposed to national financing of national party conventions and continue to explore other alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, one can only assume that those other alternatives will include contributions from Bebe Rebozo, ITT, Howard Hughes, and Arab oil money, as this type of action which we have come to expect from the morally and ethically bankrupt Republican leadership.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted a record of my 1973 income and Federal tax information, including a copy of my Federal income tax return, for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under Extensions of Remarks.

Unfortunately, there was a typographical error in the reprinting of the material on page E2761 of the May 6, 1974, RECORD which I am requesting be changed in the permanent RECORD. In line 11 of the copy of my form 1040, the figure for income interest was erroneously reported as $20,000, when in fact my interest income for the year was $20 and was so reported in the documents submitted for publication.

NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTION FINANCING

(Mr. CRANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), I think that he just took a cheap shot.

Concerning the question of public financing, I think that there are some very sound and profound philosophical reasons for objecting to it, and I am sure that those reasons will be articulated when we get into further discussion of this matter. However, to suggest impropriety as the alternative for public financing, in my estimation, is as improper and as out of line as it would be for Republicans to attempt to suggest that because of Bobby Baker or Billy Sol Estes one might indict the Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman from California may wish to participate in a more extensive debate when we get into the public financing question, and I would be happy to provide him with some of the good arguments against that concept.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 207]

Archer	Dingell	Johnson, Pa.
Bevill	Findley	Jones, Ala.
Blatnik	Flowers	Jones, N.C.
Brotzman	Frelinghuysen	Lujan
Brown, Mich.	Gray	Macdonald
Carey, N.Y.	Green, Oreg.	Madden
Carney, Ohio	Griffiths	Martin, N.C.
Chisholm	Haley	Moorhead, Calif.
Clark	Hansen, Wash.	Moorhead, Pa.
Clay	Hébert	Morgan
Conyers	Helstoski	Nichols
Derwinski	Holifield	
Diggs	Johnson, Colo.	

Patman	Rose	Stephens
Pickle	Ruppe	Stokes
Powell, Ohio	Sandman	Stubblefield
Reid	Sisk	Stuckey
Riegle	Smith, N.Y.	Treen
Roncallo, N.Y.	Stanton, James V.	Udall
Rooney, N.Y.		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 376 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

METRIC CONVERSION ACT OF 1973

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11035) to declare a national policy of converting to the metric system in the United States, and to establish a National Metric Conversion Board to coordinate the voluntary conversion to the metric system over a period of 10 years.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11035

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Metric Conversion Act of 1973".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the use of the metric system of weights and measures in the United States was authorized by the Act of July 28, 1866 (14 Stat. 339); and

(2) the United States was one of the original signatories to the Convention of the Meter (20 Stat. 709), which established the General Conference of Weights and Measures, the International Committee of Weights and Measures, and the International Bureau of Weights and Measures; and

(3) the metric measurement standards recognized and developed by the International Bureau of Weights and Measures have been adopted as the fundamental measurement standards of the United States and the customary units of weights and measures used in the United States have been since 1893 based upon such metric measurement standards; and

(4) the Governments of Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, India, Japan, New Zealand, and the Republic of South Africa have determined to convert, are converting, or have converted to the use of the metric system in their respective jurisdictions; and

(5) the United States is the only industrially developed nation which has not established a national policy committing itself to and facilitating conversion to the metric system; and

(6) as a result of the study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States authorized by Public Law 90-472 (82 Stat. 693), the Secretary of Commerce has found that increased use of the metric system in the United States is inevitable, and has concluded that a national program to achieve a metric changeover is desirable; that maximum efficiency will result and minimum costs to effect the conversion will be incurred if the conversion is carried out in general without Federal subsidies; that the goal for the changeover period be ten years, at the end of which the Nation would be predominantly, although not exclusively, metric; that a central planning and coordinating body be established and assigned to plan and coordinate the changeover in cooperation with all sectors of our society; and that immediate attention be given to education of the public and to effective United States participation in international standards making.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is therefore declared that the policy of the United States shall be:

(a) to change the United States to the metric system of weights and measures in a carefully coordinated manner in order to reduce the cost of such changeover;

(b) to implement the changeover to the metric system through the voluntary participation of the members of each affected sector and group in the Nation;

(c) to facilitate and encourage the voluntary substitution of metric measurement units for customary measurement units in education, trade, commerce and all other sectors of the economy of the United States with a view to make metric units the predominant, although not exclusive, language of measurement with respect to transactions occurring after ten years from the date the Board commences implementation of the changeover plan pursuant to section 11;

(d) to encourage efficiency and minimize overall costs to society through application of the general principle that changeover costs shall lie where they fall;

(e) to assist in the development of a broad educational program to be carried out in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning, as well as with the public at large, designed to enable all Americans to think and work in metric terms;

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) The term "metric system of measurement" means the International System of Units as established by the General Conference of Weights and Measures in 1960 and interpreted or modified for the United States by the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) The term "engineering standard" means a standard which prescribes a concise set of conditions and requirements to be satisfied by a material, product, process, procedure, convention, test method, and the physical, functional, performance and/or conformance characteristics thereof.

(c) The term "international standard or recommendation" means an engineering standard or recommendation formulated and promulgated by an international organization and recommended for adoption by individual nations as a national standard.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL METRIC CONVERSION BOARD

SEC. 5. There is hereby established a National Metric Conversion Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") to implement the policy set out in this Act.

SEC. 6. The composition of the Board shall be as follows:

(a) twenty-one persons appointed by the President who shall serve at his pleasure and for such terms as he shall specify who shall be broadly representative of the American society including industry, labor, business and commerce, the consumer, education, state and local government, science and engineering, and other affected groups. The President shall designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman and another to serve as the Vice Chairman of the Board;

(b) two members of the House of Representatives who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(c) two members of the Senate who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the President of the Senate.

SEC. 7. No vacancy on the Board shall impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board. Eleven members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 8. Unless otherwise provided by the Congress, the Board shall have no compulsory powers.

SEC. 9. The Board shall cease to exist no later than ten years after implementation of the plan begins as called for by section 11.

DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 10. It shall be the function of the Board to devise and carry out a broad program of encouragement, coordination, and public education with the aim of implementing the policies set forth in this Act. In carrying out this program the Board shall—

(a) consult with and take into account the interests and views of the United States commerce and industry, including small business; science; engineering; labor; education; consumers; government agencies at the Federal, State, and local level; nationally recognized standards developing and coordinating organizations; and such other individuals or groups as are considered appropriate by the Board to carry out the purposes of this section;

(b) provide for procedures whereby industry groups, under the auspices of the Board, shall formulate and recommend to the Board specific programs for coordinating the changeover in each industry and segment thereof, and for suggesting specific metric sizes, shapes, or other measurements for general use consistent with the needs and capabilities of manufacturers, suppliers, consumers, and other interested groups, and further consistent with the national interest;

(c) publicize, in an appropriate fashion, such programs and provide an opportunity for interested groups or individuals to submit comments on such programs. At the request of interested parties, the Board, in its discretion, may hold hearings with regard to such programs;

(d) facilitate and encourage the development as rapidly as practicable of new or revised engineering standards based on metric measurement units in those specific fields or areas in the United States where such standards will result in rationalization or simplification of relationships, improvements of design, or increases in economy consistent with the efficient use of energy and the conservation of natural resources;

(e) facilitate and encourage the retention in new metric language standards of those United States engineering designs, practices, and conventions that are internationally accepted or embody superior technology;

(f) cooperate with foreign governments and public and private international organizations which are or become concerned with the encouragement and coordination of increased use of metric measurement units or engineering standards based on such units, or both, with a view to gaining international recognition for metric standards proposed by the United States and to encouraging retention of equivalent customary units in international standards or recommendations during the United States changeover period;

(g) assist the public through information and educational programs to become familiar with the meaning and applicability of metric terms and measures in daily life. Programs hereunder shall include:

(1) Public information programs conducted by the Board through the use of newspapers, magazines, radio, television, other media, and through talks before appropriate citizens' groups and public organizations.

(2) Counseling and consultation by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director, National Science Foundation, with educational associations and groups so as to assure that the metric system of measurement is made a part of the curriculums of the Nation's educational institutions and that teachers and other ap-

propriate personnel are properly trained to teach the metric system of measurement.

(3) Consultation by the Secretary of Commerce with the National Conference of Weights and Measures so as to assure that State and local weights and measures officials are appropriately informed of the intended metric changeover and are thus assisted in their efforts to bring about timely amendments to weights and measures laws.

(4) Such other public information programs by any Federal agency in support of this Act which relate to the mission of the agency.

(h) consult, to the extent deemed appropriate, with foreign governments, public international organizations, and, through appropriate member organizations, provide international standards organizations. Contact with foreign governments and intergovernmental organizations shall be accomplished in consultation with the Department of State;

(i) collect, analyze, and publish information about the extent of usage of metric measurements, evaluate the costs and benefits of metric usage, and make efforts to minimize any adverse effects resulting from increasing metric usage;

(j) conduct research, and publish the results of this research on any unresolved problems associated with metric usage, including but not limited to the impact on workers and on different occupations and industries, possible increased costs to consumers, the impact on society and the economy, effects on small business, the impact on the United States international trade position, the appropriateness of using Federal procurement to affect conversion to the metric system, the proper conversion or transition period, and effects on national defense.

SEC. 11. (a) Within twelve months after funds have been appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act the Board shall, in furtherance and in support of the policy expressed in section 3 of this Act, develop and submit to the Secretary of Commerce for transmittal with his recommendations within ninety days to the President and both Houses of Congress, in accordance with subsection (b), a comprehensive plan to accomplish a changeover to the metric system of measurement in the United States. Such plan may include recommendations for legislation deemed necessary and appropriate.

(b) Upon transmittal of the plan to the President, the plan shall be delivered to both Houses of Congress on the same day and to each House while it is in session. The Board shall implement the plan after sixty (60) legislative days following the date of delivery to the Congress unless both Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution shall have disapproved the plan, in whole or in part, within the same period.

(c) If a plan is disapproved by the Congress a revised plan shall be submitted by the Board to the Secretary within sixty days. Such revised plan shall be subject to the procedures set forth in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) Any amendment to an approved plan shall also be submitted by the Board to the Secretary and the President and delivered to the Congress in accordance with the procedures set out in this section. Such amendments shall be subject to the proccdures set forth in subsection (b).

SEC. 12. The Board shall submit annual reports of its activities and progress under this Act to the Secretary, to the President, and to the Congress.

AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD

SEC. 13. In carrying out its duties, the Board is authorized to:

(a) establish a Board Executive Committee, and such other Committees of the Board as it deems desirable;

(b) establish such committees and advisory panels as it deems necessary to work with the various sectors of the American economy and governmental agencies in the development and implementation of detailed changeover plans for those sectors;

(c) conduct hearings at such times and places as it deems appropriate;

(d) enter into contracts in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties;

(e) delegate to the Executive Director such authority as it deems advisable;

(f) perform such other acts as may be necessary to carry out the duties prescribed by this Act.

SEC. 14. (a) The Board is hereby authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, donations, and bequests of property, both real and personal, and personal services, for the purposes of aiding or facilitating the work of the Board. Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts or bequests shall be deposited in the Treasury in a separate fund and shall be disbursed upon order of the Board.

(b) For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, property accepted under subsection (a) of this section shall be considered as a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

(c) Upon the request of the Board, the Secretary of the Treasury may invest and reinvest in securities of the United States any moneys contained in the fund herein authorized. Income accruing from such securities, and from any other property accepted to the credit of the fund authorized herein, shall be disbursed upon the order of the Board.

(d) Funds not expended by the Board at the time of expiration of the life of the Board shall revert to the Treasury of the United States.

COMPENSATION OF THE BOARD

SEC. 15. Members of the Board who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Board or otherwise engaged in the business of the Board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed the daily rate currently being paid grade 18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including traveltime, and, while so serving on the business of the Board away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses; including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service. Payments under this section shall not render members of the Board employees or officials of the United States for any purpose. Member of the Board who are in the employ of the United States shall be entitled to travel expenses when traveling on the business of the Board.

STAFF SERVICES

SEC. 16. (a) An Executive Director of the Board shall be appointed by the President. The Executive Director shall be responsible to the Board for carrying out the metric conversion program according to the provisions of this Act and the policies established by the Board.

(b) The Executive Director of the Board shall serve full time subject to the provisions of section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 17. (a) The Board is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Board is authorized to employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of the rate currently being paid grade 18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title, including traveltime, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of said title 5 for persons in the Government service employed: *Provided, however,* That contracts for such temporary employment may be renewed annually.

SEC. 18. Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) and such other staff services as may be requested by the Board shall be provided the Board by the Secretary of Commerce, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Board in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Board and the Secretary of Commerce. In performing these functions for the Board, the Secretary is authorized to obtain such information and assistance from other Federal agencies as may be necessary.

FUNDS FOR THE BOARD

SEC. 19. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Appropriations to carry out the provisions of this Act may remain available for obligation and expenditure for such period or periods as may be specified in the Acts making such appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 11035.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11035, the Metric Conversion Act. This bill was reported without dissenting vote by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and it has the support of the administration.

In making the change to the metric system our country is behind the rest of the world. In fact, as the map before you shows, with the exception of eight small nations, Barbados, Burma, Ghana, Liberia, Muscat and Oman, Nauru, Sierra Leone, and Southern Yemen—none of whom are important industrial powers, the United States is the only country in the world which has not made the decision to change to the metric system.

Twenty-five years ago many of our important trading partners, including Canada and England, were still using the customary measures. Today each one of them is making the change to the metric system, and only America has not officially taken this step.

The purpose of the bill is to declare, as a matter of national policy, that the United States will convert to the metric

system of weights and measures on a voluntary basis. To perform this coordinating function, the bill provides for the establishment of a National Metric Conversion Board with a life of 10 years, and with a membership of 21 persons broadly representative of all sectors of American society which will be affected by this change.

The United States is now in the early stages of converting to the metric system. Many companies have already announced that they are changing the sizes of their products and the standards to which they are manufactured to the metric system. For example, this year the General Motors Corp. announced that all automobiles manufactured in the United States, including the parts and components made by their subcontractors and other suppliers, will be made according to the metric system within the next few years. Similarly, the school systems of California, Maryland, and Massachusetts have announced that textbooks will be entirely changed to the metric system by the year 1976.

The choice before the committee and the Congress is not whether we should go on the metric system or not. That conversion has already begun. The choice is between continuing the conversion process in an entirely uncoordinated fashion, as is the case now, or going forward with the conversion process on a coordinated basis. The testimony heard by the committee indicated that there was wide agreement on the desirability of going forward with this changeover.

Furthermore, it became apparent that many firms which are now considering conversion are only awaiting a firm statement by the Congress and the President committing the United States to the conversion and to the metric system before they, too, adopt the metric system. The bill includes such a policy statement as well as provisions for the establishment of a National Metric Conversion Board to carry out the coordination function.

The bill declares that it shall be the policy of the United States to change to the metric system in a coordinated manner, and that the purpose of this coordination shall be to reduce the total cost of the changeover. The changeover shall be carried out by means of the voluntary participation of each affected sector and group in the Nation.

In order to encourage the efficient changeover and to minimize the overall costs, the general principle that changeover costs shall lie where they fall is included in the policy statement. That part of the changeover period involving active Federal participation shall be 10 years and the goal of the Federal participation in the process shall be that after 10 years metric units shall be the predominant, but not the exclusive, language of measurement in the United States. And finally, the policy of the United States shall be to assist in the development of a broad, national public education program.

The bill provides for the establishment of a National Metric Conversion Board. The Board shall be composed of 21 persons who will be appointed by the President. The members shall serve at the pleasure of the President and they shall serve such terms as he specifies. They shall be broadly representative of those groups in American society which will be affected by the changeover to the metric system, and shall include representatives of industry, labor, business and commerce, the consumer, education, State and local government, science and engineering, and other affected groups.

The membership shall include, in addition, two Members from the House of Representatives and two Members from the Senate of the United States. The President shall designate one of the Members to serve as Chairman and another to serve as Vice Chairman of the Board. The bill further provides that the Board shall have a life of 10 years and that unless otherwise provided by the Congress it shall have no compulsory powers.

The bill provides that the Board shall perform three major functions: The development of a broad, overall conversion plan for the United States, the implementation of this conversion plan in all sectors of American society where weights and measures are used, and the conduct of a program of public education in the metric system at all levels from elementary to adult education with the objective that the American people become familiar with the meaning and use of metric terms and measures in their daily lives.

The Board shall consult with and take into account the interests and views of industry, labor, the consumer, and other groups who would be affected by the changeover to the metric system. The intent of this consultation process is that each sector or industry in the country shall be asked, on a voluntary basis, to develop its own plan for the conversion to the metric system in such a time period as that group feels to be in their own best interest insofar as efficiency and minimum costs are concerned.

The Board shall carry out programs of public education and information aimed at making every citizen of the United States familiar with the metric system. These programs shall include public information activities conducted by the Board itself through the use of newspapers, magazines, radio, television, and other media; consultation by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and by the Director of the National Science Foundation with education associations and other education groups to insure that the metric system is made a part of the curriculum in all of the Nation's educational institutions and that teachers are trained to teach the metric system; consultation by the Secretary of Commerce with the National Conference of Weights and Measures to assure that weight and measure officials in each State and local jurisdiction are fully informed of the metric changeover activities in the country and are assisted in their efforts to bring about timely amendments to weight and measure laws; and such other public information activities by any Federal agency which would relate to the mission of the agency.

The bill provides that the Board shall prepare a comprehensive, overall metric conversion plan for the changeover of the United States to the metric system in accordance with the policies established by the act. The plan may include recommendations for legislation deemed necessary or appropriate by the Board. The plan shall be completed by the Board within the first 12 months after funds have been appropriated to the Board. When it is completed the plan shall be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce who, no later than 90 days after he received it shall submit it to the President and to both Houses of the Congress accompanied by such recommendations that he deems appropriate.

The bill further provides that the plan shall be submitted by the Secretary to both Houses of the Congress on the same day and on a day on which each House is in session. The Congress after reviewing the plan may disapprove it, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution within 60 days of receipt of the plan. If the plan is not disapproved by the Congress, the Board shall implement it after the 60-day congressional review period has expired. If the Congress does disapprove the plan, then the bill provides that the Board shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce a revised plan within 60 days of the date of such disapproval.

The revised plan shall be submitted by the Secretary of Commerce with his recommendations, if any, to the Congress and be subject to the same period of 60 days of review and disapproval as the original plan. If, after a plan has been approved and implementation has begun, the Board determines that there is a need to amend the plan, an amendment to the plan shall be submitted by the Board for review and approval in the same manner as the original metric conversion plan.

I am convinced that this bill is good for the country. Perhaps I will never learn the total metric system myself, but there is no doubt that today's schoolchildren will learn it sooner or later, and before long the housewife who goes shopping will understand it.

American industry has begun to adopt the metric system in growing numbers, and those companies which are going metric are doing so because it makes economic sense. Even though the change involves added cost, they are going ahead because in the long run the change will more than pay for itself.

But the change to the metric system is proceeding in an entirely uncoordinated manner with the result that the total cost of going metric is much higher than it needs to be, mainly because it will take longer. This bill will provide a way to reduce the time of the transition period and thereby reduce the total cost.

I want to stress, however, that H.R. 11035 would preserve the right of each individual and each business firm to decide whether to go metric. The bill provides that the adoption of the metric system shall be entirely voluntary. As noted, the bill would establish a National Metric Conversion Board which, among other things, would have the job of assisting

those who want to adopt the metric system and coordinate the change with others in the same industry.

The life of the Board would be limited to 10 years. After that time period we expect that the metric system would be in general use in our schools and industry, although the customary units might still be found in many places where it is advantageous to keep them.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics has had this subject under study since 1959. In 1968 our work led to the enactment of Public Law 90–472 which called upon the Secretary of Commerce to investigate and appraise the relative merits of adopting or not adopting the metric system. The result of the study was the report "A Metric America" which was issued in 1971. It recommended the adoption of the metric system over a 10-year period.

H.R. 11035 was reported by the committee after extensive hearings last spring. I know that some would like a bill that goes further by providing subsidies. The committee concluded that this would be unwise and that no exceptions should be made to the general principle that "costs shall lie where they fall." A similar bill was passed by the Senate in the 92d Congress which followed this same principle.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11035 is a step in the right direction for America. I urge its adoption by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, we will have this map in front of the House for just a few minutes. The white shows the countries not committed to the metric system, and the colored portion shows the countries that are committed to the metric system. It is very easy to see where our country stands.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what is said following what I have to say, this bill is completely voluntary. It does not cost one single solid cent, except for the administration of the bill. It is simply an attempt to try to give guidance to something that is happening in a haphazard way.

Mr. Speaker, the committee held extensive hearings on this bill. It has been pending in the Congress since 1886. I never expect to learn the metric system, and the only reason I am supporting the bill is because I think it is good for our country.

There are statements being made about this bill that are absolutely false, and I hope the Members will take the time to know what is in the bill and will support the bill.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOSHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am sure the gentleman from Texas will agree with me that we on the Science Committee fully understand the concern that has been expressed for possibly the impact on small business as a result of this bill.

With that in mind, as an effort to make legislative history today, will the gentleman from Texas respond as to whether or not he agrees with the following statement I am going to read, which is in a few brief paragraphs?

It is definitely the understanding and intent of our committee that small businesses should be able to get loans under the provisions of the Bible amendment to section 7(b) of the Small Business Act in order to meet special economic hardships that might result from passage of this metric bill.

For example, a small business that could be eligible in our view for an economic disaster relief loan would be a parts supplier to a major firm that decides to go metric and informs its suppliers that they must convert immediately to metric output in order for their products to be used in the future by the big firm.

I spoke just a few hours ago with the Small Business Administrator, our former colleague, Tom Kleppe, and he told me that he agrees with our belief that Bible amendment assistance would be available to small firms forced to convert capital equipment to metric faster than they would normally replace their equipment.

The Commerce Department and the Office of Management and Budget agree wtih this opinion, according to conversations we had with them this morning.

The committee feels that this loan assistance is completely in keeping with the "no cost" nature of this legislation and that it is consistent with our intent to let the costs of conversion lie where they fall. The small business would be required to pay back the full loan plus the Government's cost of borrowing. The SBA loans, though, are clearly necessary to assure that the small firms can get the capital they need in this time of tight money and exorbitant interest rates.

To get the best perspective on the so-called Bible amendment I would like to quote briefly from Senator BIBLE's statement on the floor of the Senate on February 7, 1973, when he introduced his legislation:

> I believe that a uniform approach of one statute would be desirable and would avoid many problems. It would consolidate the existing enactments under a single statute and provide a single framework for the extension of this loan program to other fields. We believe that helping small business into compliance with new governmental standards is sensible and it is also sound as a budget matter.

Finally, let me note that the National Small Business Association, representing almost 50,000 independent firms, has written to me advising that they support this bill as long as they are assured eligibility for SBA economic disaster relief loans.

Mr. TEAGUE. I would certainly agree with the gentleman from Ohio and would not object at all to it being written in the bill. I know the gentleman is attempting to make legislative history. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Ohio.

(Mr. MOSHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to urge my colleagues to unanimously support H.R. 11035, the Metric Conversion Act of 1973. As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development that originally investigated this legislation, I can attest to the fact that this particular measure is both necessary and beneficial to our country.

The Metric Conversion Act of 1973 would convert America's system of weights and measures from the customary inches, feet, pounds, and quarts to the metric system of centimeters, meters, kilograms, and liters. Currently, the United States is joined in its resistance to the metric system only by Barbados, Burma, Gambia, Ghana, Jamaica, Liberia, Muscat and Oman, Nauru, Sierra Leone, Southern Yemen, Tonga, and Trinidad.

I am convinced that this change is both inevitable and beneficial, and that we must now move to accomplish the change in a planned, orderly and equitable fashion. Metric conversion will provide three large areas of benefit to the United States. First, America's position in international trade will be substantially improved. Second, once completed, it should yield great savings at home and in industry because of its inherently great efficiency. I also believe that metric conversion by the United States would make a significant aspect of daily life truly international by bringing the peoples of the world closer together.

The bill before us today, H.R. 11035, declares a national policy of converting to the metric system and establishes a National Metric Conversion Board to coordinate the conversion activities over a period of 10 years. It is important to point out and to emphasize that this conversion is entirely voluntary.

At this time I would like to remind my fellow colleagues that many industries are presently in the process of converting to the metric system; many industries have already converted to the system; many industries are currently working in a system using standard measurements at home and metric measurements abroad. This latter system is extremely costly, but nevertheless must be in existence if a company desires to remain in the foreign market. A prime example of this is in the automobile industry. In our country today there are many cars on the market with metric components.

It is inevitable that we will consistently increase our use of the metric system, even in the absence of congressional action. It would seem, therefore, that the wise decision for Congress to make at this time would be to provide the country with an orderly and effective means for metric conversion. Individual States have already taken the initiative in this regard. California is leading the Nation in metrification. By the fall of 1976 all mathematics and science textbooks used

in all California schools will use only metric measurements. Ohio has road signs designated in metric and Maryland is fast following California's lead in the area of education.

The time has come for Congress to take the initiative—we cannot wait until there is a "crisis situation" before we convert to metric. H.R. 11035 gives us the opportunity, not to surge forward and become pioneers, but rather to catch up with the other nations of the world. The United States needs H.R. 11035 and we cannot afford to delay this legislation any longer.

Mr. TEAGUE. There is no question that California is in the lead and we hope all our schools will be going to the metric system.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

As the gentleman knows, this is really quite an important bill, and it goes into a great many fundamental aspects of American society, including business and education and the military and the general economy. It gets right down into the daily lives of the American people, and, as the gentleman said a minute ago, we do not know a great deal about it.

What I find it difficult to understand, I may say to the gentleman from Texas, is why a bill of this magnitude is brought here under a suspension of the rules with 20 minutes debate on each side and with no opportunity to educate ourselves. It does seem to me a bill of this kind ought to be brought in here with a rule and with opportunity to discuss it and also to amend it. I regret that the gentleman and his committee have seen fit to try to do this under a suspension. It is too important a bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. I would say to the gentleman from Indiana I agree with him completely. Our committee went to the Rules Committee and asked for an open rule on this bill. They not only gave us an open rule but they also made in order amendments that were subject to a point of order. That is exactly the reason this bill is brought before the House the way it is.

Mr. DENNIS. The gentleman is just saying he got a rule and he does not want to use it. I think we ought to have a rule.

Mr. TEAGUE. We got a rule making in order amendments that were subject to a point of order. This is a complete reversal of what we have been hearing here about closed rules. We did not ask for a closed rule. We asked for an open rule, but we certainly did not expect the committee to give us a rule making in order amendments the committee had considered thoroughly and had voted down. The Rules Committee not only wanted to give us a rule but they also wanted to write the bill.

Mr. DENNIS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but the rest of us have some input besides the Rules Committee and the gentleman's committee. It is nevertheless true that without any rule at all we are going to try to ram this through the House with 20 minutes for each side under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I will agree with the gentleman, but I still do not expect the Committee on Rules to rewrite the bill after all this hard work has been done on it.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree wholeheartedly with the chairman of the committee. I would support this measure coming to the floor of the House under an open rule.

I testified before the Committee on Rules in that behalf; but what happened was that the Rules Committee granted a special rule which permits this coming to the floor of the House—with the right to offer nongermane amendments in violation of the House Rules—amendments which are desired by certain limited elements of organized labor. These proposed nongermane amendments are contrary to the whole purpose and purport of this bill and would require the waiving rules. The measure before us would establish a Federal mechanism enabling the private economy and our private educational institutions to voluntarily convert to the metric system over a 10- to 12-year period. However, those nongermane amendments would make a boondoggle precisely of the kind the gentleman from Indiana is opposed to.

I sponsored a much stronger bill, but I reconciled myself to supporting this bill which comes to the floor of the House today, even though I felt we needed a lot more discipline because we are lagging behind. As the map which was displayed indicated, we are the last industrial country in the world that has not converted, or is not in the course of converting to the metric system.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana

Mr. DENNIS. I just wonder what the big rush is. We have been 200 years without this.

Mr. McCLORY. Let me answer that.

Mr. DENNIS. This is one of the last things the people in my district, whom I represent, are asking for.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there is no great rush here. We have been at this since the founding of our Nation. In 1790 George Washington directed Thomas Jefferson, who was then Secretary of State, to investigate the subject of a system of weights and measures. This authority to fix standards of weights and measures is provided in the Constitution, as the gentleman knows. In 1821 Secretary of State John Quincy Adams recommended that the new French system would be a viable system for our Nation to adopt.

In 1968 the Congress authorized a 3-year study, a very responsible 3-year study which was completed and came to us and to every Member of Congress in July 1971. This report provided the precise kind of mechanism that we are recommending today

It has taken a long time to get this measure to the floor of the House and it has taken a long time for this Nation to come of age, so far as the adoption of a viable system of weights and measures which we can use on an international basis. Today is the day of decision and today is the day when the Congress of the United States should recognize that we are in the 20th century, that we are a world power dealing with nations throughout the world with whom we have to carry on extensive trade and commerce. That is the reason why this legislation can benefit the entire Nation.

The educational institutions of our country are already converting. General Motors is already converting and 40,000 General Motors suppliers are already converting.

It is possible, of course, that they may want to do it in their own private individual way; but I say that the Federal Government has a responsibility to establish the mechanism by which all industry may act on a voluntary basis, and so that all education on a voluntary basis over a 10- or 12-year period of time may convert to the metric system of measurements.

The nongermane amendments that I expect will be offered, if this measure comes to the floor under the rule voted by the Rules Committee, will authorize Federal handouts, in the form of Federal subsidies, gratuities, and loans for businesses and for workers.

Let me say that 145,000 automobile repair shops without any Federal subsidies, and without any Federal compulsion, are already repairing foreign cars manufactured according to metric measurements. We do not need that kind of a subsidy program. Our private economy can and should absorb the costs. We should "let the costs lie where they fall"—as the report recommends. The exaggerated estimates of what this program of gradual conversion would cost are outlandish.

Every nation that has converted has found tremendous advantages which develop in the course of conversion, and the costs are not what they are estimated to be. In the course of converting they have developed labor-saving and cost-saving practices. Converting to the metric system would enable the Nation to improve and advance.

Let me suggest that we support this bill today. The bill after it leaves here, of course, will go to the Senate; but I think this is a good bill in its present form. All the offers of amendments have been reconciled by the committee. I have resigned myself to take this bill in this form.

The other amendments that the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) would like to offer were carefully considered by the committee over a long period of time. This is a very late date in our history for us to consider this legislation. I hope it will be adopted and approved overwhelmingly today.

Mr. Speaker, even without this legislation the United States is in the process

of converting to the metric system of weights and measures. The present legislation, H.R. 11035, does not determine whether or not this country will go metric. However, what we decide here today answers a simple question—will the changeover to the metric system in this country result from costly drift, or will it progress through efficient design? In my opinion, we must, by passing this bill, bring our unplanned and uncoordinated drift to a halt and provide a structure for change, which will thereby save the people of this country millions of dollars that otherwise will be lost through inefficiency and waste.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, Thomas Jefferson, then Secretary of State under President Washington, attempted to establish a uniform and stable system of weights and measures, in which all units of measure would be divisible by 10. At about this same time the metric system was developed in France. It possessed many qualities that had appealed to Jefferson, and it has had great and lasting influence throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, to a degree Jefferson's early efforts in this country bore fruit, but only after the passage of many years. The Congress sanctioned the metric system in 1866 for use in this country. Later this country endorse the Treaty of the Meter and joined every other major country in the world in endorsing the metric system as the internationally preferred system of weights and measures. In 1893, the metric system was adopted as the standard of measure for this Nation.

All during this time there were great pressures applied to Congress to prevent the country from adopting the metric system as the predominant language of measure. There were several reasons for this obdurate opposition. For example, some people objected to the metric system because it was considered to be "foreign" and thus not to be trusted. Foreign, however, did not mean England and its dependencies. These English-speaking countries represented our major trading partners. Along with Japan, these same countries are still major trading partners—but with a difference. They have all made conversion to the metric system. Thus, if we are to retain our old trading partners, remain competitive, and enlarge our position in world trade, we too must convert to metric.

This is a step that many companies have recognized as vital and have taken on their own initiative, allowing costs to lie where they fall. For example, one of the most outspoken opponents of the metric system for many years was the automobile industry, but it has now begun a voluntary conversion program. This step was not taken because the industry suddenly realized that the metric system was the superior kind of measure—only because it became economically necessary to convert and thereby remain competitive.

Mr. Speaker, so far in this country economic compulsion has been the driving force for voluntary conversion. H.R. 11035 will retain this free enterprise characteristic. The bill calls for a voluntary conversion over a 10-year period so that at the end of the goal year, 1986, the Nation will be predominantly but not exclusively metric. Thus, large and small business and other sectors of the economy are not being compelled to convert to the metric system. To the contrary, all segments of our society will voluntarily decide to convert when it becomes economically feasible, if not profitable, for them to do so. The Metric Conversion Board, made up of representative segments of our economy, will coordinate and plan continuing metric conversion, taking all viewpoints into consideration.

In addition, it is important to point out that attempts by certain groups to adversely influence the Congress against metric conversion by citing conversion costs of billions of dollars, with little or no real substantiation for such claims, have been of no avail. Up to this time we have had no such costs and we expect none in the future. If this country was not already going metric and if adopting this legislation meant that we would in a mandatory way change over to metric the next day, then and only then would conversion costs be of the proportions claimed by these groups. Out of consideration of and concern for conversion costs, Congress decided to extend the voluntary conversion period over 40 years—more time may be granted by the Metric Conversion Board if it is necessary—so that we can have a reasonable length of time in which to convert. In 10 years many instruments, machines, and so forth, will wear out, and can be replaced with metric equivalents. It is the intent of Congress that at the end of 10 years we will be predominantly but not exclusively metric. Thus, we are tacitly recognizing that the process of conversion may not be 100-percent completed after 10 years, but that which may remain will have been planned for and coordinated with the rest of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, three labor unions, which by no means represent all labor, have been making claims about huge conversion costs and how such costs will hurt the worker and the country. We know that over 10 years the costs will not be high and that in the experience of the rest of the world, the workers, have, indeed, benefited from metric conversion. For example, I recently received a telegram from the English Metrication Board in London, in which it is made quite clear that workers in Great Britain have supported metric conversion. The main point English labor wanted to make clear was that it did not favor a prolonged conversion period. The telegram reported that by the end of 1973 over 80 percent by value of all new design in Great Britain was metric, except in the public sector where the changeover is virtually accomplished. In addition, almost all materials and components are now being made in metric sizes in that country.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that in every country in the world that has recently undertaken metric conversion the workers have supported such a change. I can only conclude that they have taken such a position because it serves their best interests. Thus, I am sure that the majority of the workers in the United States support metric conversion and the present legislation. Experience in this country has shown that companies replace measurement-sensitive tools for their workers and provide on-the-job instruction of the metric system to their workers, some of whom have found the metric system easier to learn than the customary system and have said so for publication.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that most of the tools used by workers in this country and elsewhere are not measurement sensitive, that is, very few tools now in use would have to be replaced with metric tools. For example, a carpenter may need a new measuring tape or simply use the metric measure on his dual unit tape, but he will not need to buy new hammers, saws, nails, et cetera. For auto mechanics, such a changeover will make little difference since they have been repairing metric made foreign autos for years and have had the tools for just as long.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to education, we have been instructing our young scientists and engineers for many years in the use of the metric system. It is worthy of our attention to note that the metric system has been and still is the language of measure in our outstanding and famous scientific community. Most of our scientific institutions are predominantly metric and have been for years. In regard to general public instruction, I have been told that California has begun the conversion process in all of its public schools, and that other State school systems are taking similar steps.

Mr. Speaker, I have a deep and abiding faith and confidence in the ability of the American people to learn and adapt to new conditions, even a different manner of measure. There are abundant examples of this ability to change throughout our history and even in the present. This is what makes our country great and strong. However, the question is not will we change, but how will we change? This is what is so crucial about this legislation. In order to prevent waste, duplication of effort, and other costly problems, we must have a structure for a planned change. This is the only way to prevent waste and the astronomical costs and damage to workers. Some groups are so overly concerned about their particular interests that they fail to recognize the voluntary nature of our planned and coordinated conversion to metric. They fail to understand that each sector of the economy will be represented and have its interests represented on the Metric Conversion Board. In another regard, we must coordinate and promote metric conversion if this Nation is to have any influence on the establishment of world metric standards, in which we must participate actively—if we are to remain competitive in world markets. I call upon all my colleagues to support the present legislation and vote for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, why it is that when we propose a Federal program—or we propose the cooperation and assistance of a Federal department or agency—we feel

there has to be a Federal subsidy, I do not know.

Opponents of this legislation today, purporting to speak for the working men and women of the Nation, want us to vote a subsidy, a gratuity, for tools for workmen—or reparation. The working men and women of the Nation are not so useless—so helpless—that they cannot secure their own tools—without the creation of a new Federal bureaucracy and a handout of Federal funds.

According to my advice there are 145,000 automobile repair shops in this country, all of which already have the tools with which they can repair Volksvagens—and other cars made according to the metric system.

Carpenters will be able to use their same hammers. And it will take them but a few hours to adjust to the use of centimeters and meters on their new rules and squares and other measuring devices.

And whatever they do, they will do voluntarily with the other carpenters and tradesmen—over a 10- or 12-year period—with a maximum of cooperation—and a minimum of governmental interference—as well as a minimum of personal expense—or inconvenience.

This is a relatively weak bill. It provides very little in the way of Federal compulsion. In my view, we would benefit far more from a measure which contained greater discipline—and which would avoid the opportunities for virtual nullification of this legislation by the possible disapproval of a metric conversion plan or other steps which are possible under the pending measure.

But one saving—all important—feature of this bill is that it does not provide for Federal subsidies or grants or gratuities which would convert the whole subject to metric conversion into a bureaucratic boondoggle and a maze of confusion, favoritism, and conflict.

Let me ask, for instance, what justification could we have for providing Federal grants to any economic segment of our society whether it be in the area of education, or in behalf of business large or small, or the working men and women of the country, unless at the same time we were willing to provide equal benefits for those educational institutions and systems which have already undertaken a program of metric conversion with their own resources, their own funds, or with money borrowed in order to carry out a voluntary program, including funds which they have already repayed.

The metric study which was undertaken over a period of 3 years, and which was followed by a survey of business, large and small, as well as the educational community and other areas of interest in this subject, indicated no justification for any such subsidy or grant programs. The report contained a flat proposal that the costs shall fall where they lie. Indeed, that has been the experience of other nations. This bill carries out that principle and avoids that hazard to the maximum.

And I urge you to give it your overwhelming support.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 11035, the proposed Metric Conversion Act of 1973.

My reluctance stems from two sources. First, I find myself opposing two great friends for whom I have the greatest respect, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS), the chairmen of the full committee and the subcommittee, respectively, out of which the bill was reported. These two gentlemen have worked diligently to come up with a measure that would ease the trauma of metric transition for as many Americans as possible.

Second, I find myself in the most awkward position of opposing the passage of a bill which, in principle, I favor. As a matter of fact, I have sponsored bills similar to H.R. 11035 in this Congress and the 92d Congress. My objections go, not to the substance of H.R. 11035, but to its being considered under suspension of the rules.

H.R. 11035 was the subject of intense consideration in the Rules Committee, of which I am a member. A rule was granted for this bill on March 11 of this year. It is an open rule, permitting full and open discussion of the merits of the bill and of any amendments a Member of the House might wish to offer. It also makes in order the offering of two possibly nongermane amendments, covering matters which were considered by the legislative committee but rejected.

Yet today the House is being asked to approve this highly controversial bill under a procedure more properly reserved for noncontroversial matters—a procedure which completely precludes any amendments.

I am convinced that at least three amendments to H.R. 11035 are necessary.

The first is one to extend the transition period from 10 years to 15 years. The committee took its 10-year figure directly from the study, "A Metric America," from which the basic conversion recommendation was taken. That study offers no solid justification for choosing 10 years. Some wanted more time, the study said, and some wanted less. My own contacts among business and labor representatives almost universally favor a longer transition period. The administration, through the Department of Commerce, has informed me that it "would have no objection to extending the changeover period from 10 to 15 years and prolonging the life of the Board from 10 to 15 years."

Another amendment I am unable to offer today because of the procedural setting concerns small businessmen. My amendment would make eligible for SBA loans those small businessmen who would suffer serious economic injury as a result of the conversion plan. The National Federation of Independent Business, with about 350,000 members, testified some time ago that it would oppose any metric bill not including this loan authorization. In fact, the "Metric America" study admitted that:

> The Government would have a special responsibility toward small businessmen in the conversion period, and that training programs and other forms of technical assistance might warrant Government support.

The third amendment to H.R. 11035 which I am being denied the privilege of offering, relates to worker assistance. Many thousands of individual workers are required by employers to furnish their own tools. Many work for several employers in the course of a year. One labor union alone, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, estimates that its members would lose some $350 million dollars if H.R. 11035 were to pass as reported. It is beyond the technical capacity of an individual Member to calculate what the overall costs of worker assistance might be; indeed, the committee itself finds it impossible to put an accurate price tag on overall conversion. So my amendment is formulated in the most flexible terms possible, to give the Board the authority needed to assist workers who would be injured by the conversion. This, too, was recognized by the "Metric America" study. In addition to technical training for self-employed craftsmen, which "might warrant Government support," the report states that:

> Workers' loss of experience would be real and substantial, and that it would be important to ensure that this problem is dealt with equitably in the design of a national plan.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying principle in H.R. 11035 is that metric conversion should "let the costs lie where they fall." This ignores the fact that the legislation itself causes the costs to fall differently than if no legislation were enacted. Indeed, if the legislation were not designed to speed up the conversion process, there would be little justification for it.

Unfortunately, the suspension procedure provides no opportunity to debate these issues fully. I urge my colleagues, therefore, to oppose passage of H.R. 11035 under suspension of the rules, so that it can be considered under the rule already accorded it by the Rules Committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman yield for just 1 minute for a question?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Did the gentleman appear before the committee or express any interest in these ideas before it went to the Rules Committee?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Did I appear before the committee?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. No, because I was not notified as to when the hearings were being held.

Mr. TEAGUE. At the beginning of this Congress it was announced that this bill would be taken up. If the gentleman had been really interested, he would have let it be known.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I will point out to the gentleman that the

amendments which I propose were even recommended by his study called "Metric America." Why the gentleman's committee, after 3 years of study coming up with a recommendation, turned down the recommendations, I do not know.

Mr. TEAGUE. If the gentleman will yield further, every amendment the gentleman has suggested was considered and was voted down.

In fact, some of them were considered so far out of line that they did not even vote on them. The amendments were considered in committee, and the Department of Commerce recommended 10 years; they did not recommend 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would not object to 15 years. It is completely voluntary. There is not one compulsory thing in this bill except to provide for a study.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish first to respond to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) and then I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

The gentleman will recall that when this measure was taken before the Committee on Rules, hearings were held. At that time real interest was created among labor representatives, and the Carpenters Union, in particular, was really concerned about this bill as it was reported out by the gentleman's committee, and its representatives suggested an amendment. I would like to offer such an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the small businessmen's association, the National Federation of Independent Business, consisting of 350,000 or more members throughout the United States, voiced opposition to the bill as it was reported out of the gentleman's committee, and I proposed to quell that objection by offering an amendment, as was proposed by that businessmen's association.

These amendments, the gentleman will recall, are in keeping with recommendations in the committee's very own report called "A Metric America."

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will check, he will find that to be so. I see that the gentleman is shaking his head.

The amendments which I propose to offer, in any event, were discussed fully in the committee and rejected. But why should we not, under the open rule which was granted by the Committee on Rules, have an open debate here on the floor, and allow the House to determine whether the amendments should be adopted or rejected?

I am all for the bill. As the gentleman knows, I was one of only four members in the Committee on Rules who voted to report the bill out in its original form under an open rule. That effort, however, failed, and it was only after I had worked up an amended rule, making my amendments in order, that the rule was granted. All I am asking is that the bill, H.R. 11035, be called up for consideration by the House under that rule, instead of under suspension of the rules.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman one more question:

Did not the report state that the costs shall be borne where they lie?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, this is what the committee proposal intends to do. However——

Mr. TEAGUE. It is what the report says.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Yes, the report says that, and my amendments would put the costs squarely where they lie, and would be directly in line with what the committee intended.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has expired.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I do not have any further time in which to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA), so that the gentleman from Illinois may ask a question.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the question I have is this:

The legislation before us provides that there would be a plan which would come back to the House of Representatives after a year, and there would be 60 days provided within which the House and the Senate could disapprove the plan. Among the powers given to the Metric Conversion Commission is the power to recommend legislation for the House and the Senate to consider. So that if any such legislation was recommended by them or by the representatives of labor, under the Metric Planning Commission, if it was recommended that we should have a subsidy provided for labor, and that we should pay for the tools of the working men and provide subsidies for an educational program—which I do not think is essential at all—but if that were decided, then we would have an opportunity at a later time to pass upon that proposition.

We do not need, Mr. Speaker, to build this provision into the bill at the present time and create another bureaucratic monster.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I was granted 1 additional minute so that the gentleman could ask a question, not make a statement.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman: Is that not a fact, that it would be in the bill and we could get those proposals from the Commission as provided?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has expired.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the gentleman has used all the time at my disposal.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman if he will yield me additional time.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman whatever time I use.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) for coming before the committee and offering his thoughts. The gentleman gave us his views, after giving a lot of thought and study to this bill, which I know the gentleman opposes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks and say to him that while we are on opposite sides of this issue it is not often we find ourselves so arrayed.

Mr. Speaker, before the end of this debate of only 40 minutes, on a bill that is estimated to cost the people of this country between $60 billion and $100 billion, I would like to hear an explanation of why it is before us under suspension of the rules instead of the rule that was granted some 6 weeks ago that would have permitted 2 hours.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I would like to make my statement.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will yield the gentleman another minute if he will allow me time to answer that.

Mr. GROSS. How many minutes did the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. It is the amendments that have been offered that would cost $60 billion. It is not what is in the bill but it is the amendments that have been offered that would cost that.

Mr. GROSS. How much time did the gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. TEAGUE. Whatever I used I will yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, how much time did the gentleman consume?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last year I presented to the House a study by the General Accounting Office which thoroughly discredited the Department of Commerce report urging the establishment of an accelerated program to convert this country to the metric system.

I asked the GAO to make a study of the report because I suspected it was biased. Those suspicions were fully confirmed.

I have also obtained a transcript of a meeting held by members of the Commerce Department's Metric System Study Advisory Panel, at which the Department's report to Congress was discussed.

Mr. Speaker, this document is a blueprint of how to deceive the American people and Congress. I do not believe I have ever read a more damning record of such intent.

The writers of the Commerce Department report, urging conversion to the metric system, were afraid that if the American people knew the true costs of this project they would reject it out of hand. So, they simply decided not to tell them. And they decided not to tell the Members of Congress.

The comments of members of the advisory panel are most interesting. These people knew the cost of the proposed conversion would be a staggering $60 billion or more. Not $10 billion, or $20 billion, but $60 billion.

It bothered panel member William J. Harris, a vice president of the Association of American Railroads. He said:

I think the $60 billion figure is just going to stick in people's minds and . . . stick in people's throats, and I don't know what to do about it . . . It comes out awfully hard, even though you have explained around it.

Panel member Daniel De Simone, who was also the director of the study responded in this fashion:

Bill, what you say about the $60 billion figure has been said by many other people who consider it rather scary and unwarranted in terms of the data we have analyzed.

The next panel member to comment on this staggering cost figure was William D. Rinehart, assistant general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association Research Institute, who had this to say:

The bill, as provided by Congress, asked the Commerce Department to evaluate the cost. Sixty billion, if that's the cost, I think it is the responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce to record it as such.

To hide it or to put it into some other form in this report would cause the report to be dishonest.

This is precisely what happened.

Earlier in the meeting, however, Mr. De Simone had, in effect, dismissed the necessity of stating the cost in the report by saying,

We can almost presume that Congressmen and Senators will not read the whole thing.

That bears repeating.

We can almost presume that Congressmen and Senators will not read the whole thing.

Perhaps he was right.

Thomas Hannigan, director of research and education for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers said:

What we should be doing is something for the Congressmen, as the law requires . . . it's an attempt to bypass Congress, an attempt to go to the constituents without going through Congress.

It is a biased promotional effort and, therefore, actually in effect going beyond Congress.

Mr. Hannigan went on to criticize the report's drafters and said,

. . . I cannot go along with this report with my name on it, because it's going to be subject to intense criticism, the mass public is against it.

Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has told us that the Commerce Department's metric report is twisted, distorted and misleading.

One of the Department's advisory panel members decries the "terrible bias that flows through here" and calls it nothing more than "a biased promotional effort."

Another member fears what would happen if the Congress and the public were told what the cost will be and, as any of you who have read the report know, the $60 billion cost figure does not appear in it. Of course, the author, Mr. De Simone, did not expect many of us to read the report in the first place.

I do not believe it would be either fair or principled for Members of this body to approve legislation, on the strength of a biased report, that will cost the American taxpayers $60 billion.

If such a question were put to the people themselves, I am convinced that they would flatly reject it. The transcript of the advisory panel meeting shows the same conviction.

The proponents of this legislation would have you believe that the conversion mandated by it will be a purely voluntary thing. If voluntary conversion is what is sought, then I submit there is no need whatsoever for this bill.

The proponents of this legislation would have you believe that the American people are fairly beating down the doors of Congress, demanding that it be passed. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I know of no housewife who is looking forward to buying a complete new set of measuring cups and spoons, or of having to learn to cook all over again using metric recipes.

Hank Aaron will no longer hit a baseball a country mile and you will not be able to walk that far for a Camel. Metric will be good for the advertising agencies and some special interests, but bad, thoroughly bad for the average American for he will have to pay the $60 billion this legislation will cost.

I want to remind Members of the House once again that no less an authority than the Comptroller General of the United States has said that this 10-year crash conversion program will:

Be more costly than the 50-year no-plan change-over—contrary to what was shown by the (Commerce Department's) Study.

The General Accounting Office also concluded that this crash metric conversion program:

Would tend to increase costs and prices of (United States) products and thus place these products at even more of a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis the products of foreign firms that are already metric.

In addition to increasing costs of U.S. products, the General Accounting Office has found that this program will also dramatically increase imports of metric products into this country.

And there is no proof whatever that this legislation will bring one scintilla of benefit to the people of this country.

The one sure thing involved in all of this is a minimum price tag of $60 billion.

We already have enough problems in this country without saddling our people with such an enormous additional burden.

The people of this country have given no indication they want this legislation and I urge that it be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my good friend and colleague from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) for granting me this time given the limited time available under this suspension procedure and the fact that I am not a member of the committee. I am in wholehearted and enthusiastic support of the Metric Conversion Act as reported by the committee and intend to vote for it on final passage today.

Mr. Speaker, we have often been accused of being a Congress by crisis—responding and acting on problems only when they reach crisis proportions. And I suppose there will be some who will argue here today that because we are not currently saddled with a metric crisis, this legislation is unnecessary. We have enough immediate crises to deal with, they will argue, without having to worry about a long-range program for converting to the metric system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take issue with that attitude. I would suggest that our public image would not be so low today, and we would not be confronted with as many crises today, if we had only bothered to do a little long-range planning on problems before they got out of hand and became crises. That is exactly what we are being asked to do in this legislation today. And I do not think I am overstating the case one bit by suggesting that unless we act now on metric conversion, it will one day come back to haunt us as a crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to claim as a constituent one of the most renowned experts on metrication, Mr. Kenyon Y. Taylor, president of Beloit Tool Corp. and coauthor of two books on metric conversion. Here is what he had to say in his testimony before the House Science and Astronautics Committee:

When international pressures force conversion, assuming we do not have a coherent national program, only those few companies which have planned ahead, or which are multi-national and have foreign operations capable of supplying guidance and products, will be able to survive. The smaller industrial organizations which have no foreign components, which have not systematically prepared for conversion, will find themselves faced with excessive re-tooling costs as well as intense international competition with extensive metric experience.

Mr. Taylor went on to testify, and again I quote:

Conversion to the metric system is inevitable. As the world becomes smaller, as competition for trade increases, the United States—to date the only major power not utilizing the metric system—will find itself involved in an expensive crash program which no doubt will result in too little too late, unless we begin planning now.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that there are some who object to this bill on the grounds that metric conversion will be costly and disruptive. But I would submit that if we do not act now on a rational and national long-range conversion program, we will one day be faced with staggering

costs and chaos by comparison. To those who say, we cannot afford to, I can only respond, we cannot afford not to. I therefore urge passage of this bill today.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the full text of Mr. Taylor's statement to the House Science and Astronautics Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

BELOIT TOOL CORP.,
South Beloit, Ill., March 22, 1973.

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: Following your suggestion subsequent to the opening session of the Metric Sub-Committee meeting on Monday, March 19, 1973, I would like to confirm for the record my verbal comments to you and other members of the Committee.

We urgently need a Federal Metric Conversion Coordinating Commission which can provide guidance and serve as a clearinghouse for information on metrication—conversion to the Metric System. While many industrial enterprises of all sizes already have begun the process, including large organizations such as IBM, Caterpillar, Minneapolis Honeywell, and others, many more, particularly the smaller ones, have not. Sources of information and assistance are extremely limited. No overall national direction exists. When International pressures force conversion, assuming we do not have a coherent national program, only those few companies which have planned ahead, or which are multi-national and have foreign operations capable of supplying guidance and products, will be able to survive. The smaller industrial organizations which have no foreign components; which have not systematically prepared for conversion, will find themselves faced with excessive retooling costs as well as intense international competition with extensive metric experience.

Subsidies are not needed. Additional lengthy studies are not needed. Trial runs are not needed. What is needed is a Federal commission which can implement a well-planned schedule for orderly conversion to a metric America within a logical, acceptable time frame, administered by Congress and free of domination by large industry or special interest groups, enabling thousands of small business concerns to convert to the metric system in an orderly manner at minimum cost. I favor the time frame of ten years, as is proposed in legislation (HR 2351) introduced by Representative Robert McClory (R-Ill.) which would establish the metric system as the nation's only legal system of weights and measures a decade after passage. We need a law such as this to encourage smaller industrial organizations to begin metrication now, and to take advantage of assistance available from the federal commission which also would be established. We need this legislation not so much for the sake of the small industrialists, but more for the sake of the vital segment of the economy which they represent.

Four myths now discourage many small industrial organizations from implementing conversion procedures: The first myth has it that conversion involves extensive costs. From everything we have seen and heard, and we have been on the front-lines for the past ten years, estimated costs of conversion as presented in the U.S. Metric Study report and in testimony in Senate hearings seem greatly exaggerated. In fact, given some basic planning, firms presently undergoing conversion estimate that what costs are incurred can be recaptured in a period as short as one year. Present tax provisions involving investment credit and accelerated depreciation make retooling very feasible, and costs of supplying employees with necessary personal hand tools have proved to be only a fraction of estimates.

The second myth is that conversion to the metric system will have negative impact on the average factory worker. We now have enough experience to know that this is untrue. Even older employees accept and adapt to the new system quickly. What special training is required can be provided very inexpensively on an on-the-job or pre-employment basis. Any unusual problems can be handled through collective bargaining at the plant level.

The third myth intimates that conversion will create virtually endless confusion and, as a result, reduced productivity and efficiency. But the facts of the matter indicate the opposite. Some companies already have found that use of the metric system in their foreign operations results in simpler, more accurate computations, reduced inventories, and a rationalized product line which can move freely across national borders without tariff. The Common Market, for example, has ruled that after 1978 importation of non-metric products will be disallowed.

The fourth myth is that metrication will never occur so there's no need to worry about it. But I submit that conversion to the metric system is inevitable. As the world becomes smaller, as competition for trade increases, the United States—to date the only major power not utilizing the metric system—will find itself involved in an expensive crash metrication program which no doubt will result in too little too late, unless we begin planning now. Present demand for information and assistance in regard to metrication far exceeds available supply. The main source of information and assistance is Beloit Tool Corporation. Just to give you an idea of the demand, we have sixteen men in the field whose job is to conduct seminars and other educational programs on metrication. Several thousand representatives of industry already have attended more than 400 such seminars in the last three years alone. As another example, not too long ago I coauthored two books on metrication, *"USA Goes Metric" and "Discover . . . Why Metrics"*. The demand was so overwhelming that we had to establish our own publishing house, Swani, and to date more than 150,000 copies of the books have been distributed. But our resources are limited and we can only hope to satisfy a small fraction of the overall demand.

In addition to my corporate responsibilities with Beloit Tool Corporation, I am affiliated with the Center for Metric Education, University of Michigan at Kalamazoo, which was established by the Office of Education to develop metric curricula for 1100 vocational and technical schools; Metric Advisory Council of the Society of Manufacturing Engineers, and the Metric Advisory Council of the Metal-Cutting Tool Institute. In all these areas the need for strong leadership from Congress is evident.

Sincerely,

KENYON Y. TAYLOR,
President.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the argument presented by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) as to the $60 billion that the gentleman was talking about, let me say that not one dime of that is mandated as an expenditure under this bill. Not one dime of that is going to come out of the Federal Treasury, but only from those companies who choose to voluntarily convert to this system.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I had an amendment to this bill, but inasmuch as the bill is being considered under a suspension of the rules, as the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has suggested, there is no opportunity to offer that amendment. I would therefore respectfully refer the Members to page 21 of the committee report on which that amendment is discussed at some length.

The amendment simply would have provided for the authority of the executive branch of this Government or the Congress, to approve any conversion plan developed by the board to insure that the people who will implement this proposal in the real world will have an input into the final product.

Mr. Speaker, if I had had the chance to offer this amendment I am confident that every Member in this body would favor its adoption. If you oppose the bill and the conversion program it would be one more step in the final adoption. If you favor conversion, then approval of the executive branch would strengthen the conversion, and unify the efforts for conversion. If you are on this side of the aisle, then you put the monkey on the back of the administration for approval. If you are on the other side of the aisle you give the administration an opportunity for effective input into a final plan. If you are a liberal, you insure greater input of Government in the process of conversion. If you are a conservative, you have more control over the independent board prior to conversion.

Mr. Speaker, as I have suggested, I am sure everyone in this House would have supported this amendment if I had the chance to offer it for consideration.

What this plan is going to do is to create a Board composed of 21 people appointed by the President who will be broadly representative of the American society, including industry, labor, business and commerce, the consumer, education, State and local governments, science and engineering, and other affected groups—whatever that is.

In the subcommittee, and in the full committee, the plan was originally conceived to be subject to approval by the President. That was stricken out. The plan then was conceived to be approved by the Secretary of Commerce, and that was stricken out. Now this bill before us has no approval of any representative of the executive branch or of any agency designed to implement the program. It is not even required to be shown to the Department of Commerce prior to the time it is submitted to the Congress, and we then have 60 days in which to reject it by concurrent resolution.

I respectfully suggest that we cannot blow our collective noses around here in 60 days.

Mr. Speaker, I commend both Chairman TEAGUE of the full committee and Chairman DAVIS of the subcommittee for their long and tireless efforts on behalf

of this legislation. I feel that the legislation they are now proposing reflects an imaginative and generally well-reasoned approach to metric conversion. But I do feel that the bill does reflect one major shortcoming—a shortcoming which can be remedied with only a minor change of language. I refer to a provision that would require that the plan generated by the National Metric Conversion Board for metric conversion within the United States be submitted to the President, as well as to the Congress, for review and approval.

Mr. Speaker, the original administration metric bill submitted to the Congress provided for the metric conversion plan, to be submitted to the President for review and approval, and, to the Congress for review only. My amendment, in essence, addresses what I feel to be the appropriate role of the executive branch and the Congress with respect to the review and approval of the metric conversion plan.

The recommendations in the administration bill were the results of an exhaustive 3-year study commissioned by the Congress and directed by the Department of Commerce. The 42-member panel which performed the study based its findings on extensive public hearings, supplementary investigations, plus invited oral and written contributions to numerous conferences. Altogether, some 200 presentations were offered and discussed not including approximately 100 additional written papers which were received.

Based upon these findings, the Secretary of Commerce recommended that final review and approval/disapproval power for the metrication plan be vested in the Congress and the President respectively. This recommendation that the President be the sole approving authority was in recognition of the fact that metric conversion in the United States impacts significantly on such vital areas as the U.S. stake in world trade, our relations with global trading partners, the transacting of domestic business in both the public and private sectors, and in fact, our national security.

However, based upon further independent analysis or study, the provision requiring formal executive branch approval has now been deleted by the Science Committee. The rationale which was propounded for the amendment was that the Secretary of Commerce, as spokesman for the President, would provide appropriate executive perspective through his "recommendations."

Mr. Speaker, I take exception to our preempting the executive branch from playing a more substantive role in the conversion of this Nation to the metric system. I disagree because the counsel and expertise upon which the Chief Executive and the Commerce Department will base its recommendations represent a significant and independent source separate and distinct from that of either the National Metric Conversion Board or the Congress.

Instead of a truly substantive involvement, the executive branch now has no authority in this entire matter except to transmit its recommendations to the Congress for consideration. In fact, there is not even a requirement that the Secretary of Commerce be permitted to see the metric plan until the plan has been completed and prepared for final transmittal to the Congress. I would emphasize one further point in this regard. Although the administration originally acquiesced to the final recommendations of the Science Committee downgrading the role of the executive branch, the administration has now changed its position and is strongly in favor with the amendment I am proposing today. The administration's support for the change I am recommending was communicated directly to me within the past several weeks. The rationale for the administration recommendation is identical to that which I have been discussing and which appears on page 21 as my additional views in the committee report.

In my opinion, we are implementing a major and far-reaching change in our system of weights and measures by the passage of this bill and the subsequent adoption of the conversion plan. Clearly, the public interest demands that this Nation summon its full executive and legislative resources in accomplishing the conversion.

I therefore regret that the legislation in its present form adopts the parochial point of views that the Congress be established as the only body of expertise in approving or disapproving a formal plan for the conversion of our Nation to the metric system.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has been foundering long enough in its totally uncoordinated conversion to the metric system. It would be desirable if we took the necessary step to provide for a more planned and coordinated conversion—a conversion which means significant international trade advantages, a more simplified commercial system, a stimulated industry, and a large savings for the American consumer, but we can not abrogate our responsibilities to insure that that conversion plan be realistic and effective.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARRIS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to say to the gentleman that I, for one, support his amendment. If it comes up in conference, I shall vote for it.

Mr. PARRIS. I appreciate very much the chairman's statement, and I appreciate his position in that regard.

I would simply suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is perhaps a technical but, in my opinion, fatal defect in this bill, and that the public interest demands that this nation summon all of the expertise of the legislative and the executive branches in developing a plan and accomplishing a conversion to make a major change in our basic system of weights and measures, rather than leave the final development and implementation of a conversion plan to an appointed board, which we will not in realistic terms be able to control.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. PARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I noted that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) did not say who is going to pay this enormous bill. He questioned my statement, but he did not say who was going to cough up at least $60 billion. The gentleman in the well of the House and every other Member of the House knows very well that the toolmakers in Rockford, Ill., are going to hand the cost right on down to those who buy their tools, and so will the manufacturers of every other product.

Mr. PARRIS. The people who are going to pay for this, ultimately, are the people who pay for everything in the United States—the consumers.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are concerned with our balance of payments and our position in world technology in highly sophisticated products, the people of this country are surely going to pay if we do not see the wisdom of adopting the metric system that will enable us to be truly competitive in the markets of the world—in Trinidad, in Southern Yemen, Tobago, and countries like that, fine, but then do not expect the United States to remain a competitive force.

Mr. PARRIS. I would respectively suggest the gentleman review the comments made by the GAO in its report printed in the hearings on this legislation, and particularly as it relates to the expected increase in imports after conversion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right. Let him read the GAO report.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's case emphasizes the need to defeat the bill as presented under the suspension of the rules, because even the chairman of the committee recognizes the merits and soundness of the gentleman's amendment. Yet he is proscribed from offering it because the bill is being considered under suspension.

Mr. PARRIS. I would say to the gentleman I have great and high regard for the chairman of the committee and for the chairman of the subcommittee, who put a great deal of effort into this legislation, but it is simply in its present form, a defective legislative proposal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

(Mr. MOSHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, the National Small Business Association says that its position on metric conversion by H.R. 11035 is that is supports voluntary conversion which this bill calls for, provided there is economic-disaster-type loans made available to small business. Earlier in the session in colloquy with the chairman of the committe, we certainly made legislative history here, indicating the committee's intention, and I think the Congress intends that such loans would be available.

The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1974.

Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOSHER: National Small Business Association's position on the metric conversion bill, H.R. 11035, is that it supports voluntary conversion, provided there is economic disaster-type loans made available to small business.

It is our understanding the Small Business Administration has determined that under existing authority it may make economic disaster-type loans under Section 7(b)(5) of the SBA Act. It is also our understanding that the Office of Management and Budget and the Commerce Department concur in this decision.

It is important that the foregoing references to the SBA and OMB and the Commerce Department be made part of the legislative history.

Should the vote go against the metric bill today NSB will make every effort to see that an amendment providing economic disaster-type loans at reasonable interest rates is introduced on the floor the next time the bill is considered.

This loan provision is not inconsistent with the expressed intent of the Congress which states that costs of conversion must lie where they fall. A loan provision is not a grant. It's merely federal assistance aimed at aiding compliance where necessary because of either legislative or economic compulsion upon small business.

Sincerely,

CARL BECK,
Chairman, Metric Committee.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that metrication means doing what comes most naturally. In weights and measures, that is.

This metric conversion program is a superb example of American commonsense and practicality. It is a move for greater accuracy, efficiency, economy and rationality.

So, Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically join with the Science Committee and subcommittee chairmen, Messrs. TEAGUE and DAVIS, and with nearly all members of our Science Committee, in strong support of H.R. 11035, which will declare as national policy our intent to convert to the metric system in the United States, to convert on an orderly basis, but to convert voluntarily.

I emphasize most emphatically that this legislation will not mandate metric on anyone. I repeat, it is a voluntary program.

Opponents talk a lot about heavy costs for industry as the price for metric conversion.

But I say it need not cost any industry anything, unless that industry decides of its own accord, voluntarily, that going metric will be a good investment that will in the long run—or immediately, probably—will be profitable.

Thus, our bill provides that only "the rule of reason" is the rule that shall prevail when any industry or firm shall determine voluntarily whether or not to go metric.

The costs to the Government, to the taxpayers, will be only those of administering the conversion program; and, again, I argue those costs will be more than warranted as a sound investment.

In fact, so sensible is metric conversion, and necessary from a good business point of view, it is happening very rapidly in our country anyway. This bill will only pick up that existing momentum and channel it most efficiently; it is a bill that only provides leadership, not coercion.

Abundant testimony before our Committee supports the need for it, especially if America is to maintain its world preeminance in science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I submit we on this world may still be in our infancy, in what we need to know and what we will learn and produce, in the realms of science and technology, and to the extent we in the United States persist in our "off horse" measures, to that extent we will increasingly fall behind the rest of the world, losing our leadership that is so crucially important for us, and I believe for humanity in general.

It is said that the establishing and acceptance of world standards in technology is still only some 10 percent complete, but the progress is rapid, and to the extent that American standards are ignored—as they will be, if not in metric terms—to that extent American industry and the American economy, including American labor, will be sorry losers.

Mr. Speaker: in the last 20 years the metric system has become the dominant language of measurement in the world. The United States stands almost alone today in our failure thus far to go metric. We are the unrealistic, hidebound, impractical island of outmoded weights and measurements.

But even within this country, the metrication is slowly but steadily increasing in use. And therein lies the problem.

The growing use of metric weights and measures in the United States is proceeding in a relatively haphazard and unplanned way, with individual companies, industries, and local governments making the changeover whenever and in whatever way it appears advantageous to do so.

The conversion thus far has therefore been best characterized by the confusion and misdirection which has resulted.

The legislation now under consideration here seeks to provide the necessary direction and coordination in this country's continuing conversion.

The primary motivation for the changeover, however, is not so much to bring order to an otherwise chaotic process of conversion; there are other, more compelling arguments.

First, there is significant potential for increased exports of our manufactured products made to metric standards; the people and industries in countries that have been predominantly metric for many years do much prefer to purchase metric designed products. Our gain in exports is estimated to be on the order of $600 million annually.

Second, there is the potential for cost savings when a common design can be used for products both here and internationally. If there is to be global uniformity of manufacturing procedures, it is now evident that it is our inch-pound measurement units which must yield since the millimeter-kilogram units are so firmly entrenched on a worldwide basis.

Furthermore, changing to metric designs affords the opportunity of greatly reducing the excessive varieties and sizes of products. The gains that can be realized by rationalizing our "off the shelf" product lines are immense. Not only can money be saved because of reduced inventories and greater production of each size, but also in materials saved, the value of which we are more aware now that the need for conservation of our resources is becoming more clearly recognized.

I also feel it important to emphasize that the goal of the metric legislation is to promote a voluntary conversion in which this country would become predominantly, although not exclusively, metric.

The objective of this legislation is not complete conversion regardless of costs—it is instead metrication to the extent reasonable at a minimum cost. The point is that the conversion will proceed in some sectors at a relatively rapid pace, in certain others at a slower pace, and finally, in some sectors, there may never be a measurable impact.

And just as industry will convert to the metric system only as it is economically justifiable to do so, so will the Federal Government. Where an agency deems extra funds necessary for metric conversion, the request will have to be justified on the basis of the benefits to be obtained from the change recommended.

I would further stress to my colleagues that the present bill, as it authorizes the establishment of a National Metric Conversion Board responsible for the generation of a conversion plan, requires that the proposed conversion plan be referred to the Congress for appropriate review.

Thus, once the formal metric conversion plan has been drawn up, the sole power to approve or disapprove is vested in the Congress. I know that I can speak for my colleagues on the Science Committee when I point out that this committee will continue with a very vigorous oversight effort with respect to both the Board's activities in generating the plan, as well as the subsequent conversation itself once the plan is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, the longer the United

States waits to convert to the metric system, the longer this country will have to pay the extra costs associated with maintaining, and operating under, a dual measurement system. Clearly, it is time to get on with the business of conversion. The time has come for a national decision on a positive course of action and I sincerely welcome the opportunity to lend my support to this initiative.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSHER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is the gentleman suggesting that economic-disaster loans must be a part of the conversion to the metric system?

Mr. MOSHER. I would say certainly not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

(Mr. GOLDWATER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues of the Science Committee members in offering my enthusiastic support for the metric conversion legislation presented here today.

Mr. Speaker, over 3 years ago the Congress requested a comprehensive study of the metric question because this body sensed that the world trend toward metric usage called for a new assessment. This investigation proceeded over many different avenues including public hearings, detailed surveys of international trade, business and industry, education, and national security, to mention only a few. The result of this effort plus the combined activities of the Science Committee is reflected in the legislation now bofer us—legislation long overdue.

At the present time, this country is the only major industrialized country which does not use the metric system. With the countries of Canada, Great Britain, and Australia presently in the process of converting to metric usage, only eight small, underdeveloped nations, in addition to the United States, have yet to start metrication.

Moreover, we continue to see increasing use of the metric system in this country with a great majority of businessmen, educators, and other informed advisers emphasizing that metric conversion is in the best interests of our country. We also see convincing evidence that it is far better for the Nation to move to the metric system by plan rather than by no plan at all.

After thorough study, this committee believes that a most effective means to convert is through a national commitment to a coordinated but voluntary changeover. It also appears that this Nation should begin as quickly as possible in adopting the metric system in order to facilitate U.S. participation in developing the expanding body of international engineering standards which serve in turn to regulate world trade in scientific and technical products.

The legislation also reflects a number of key principles which will serve to guide the conversion.

The first reflects the so-called rule of reason. In effect, conversion to the metric system will be made only where and when it is advantageous to do so. In other words, individual organizations will make this determination on their own as to the worthwhileness of converting their own particular operations.

There is also no provision for subsidies, cost reimbursements, tax remittances, or the like. The committee has concluded that this type of financial assistance may encourage unreasonable or unnecessary changes whereas the policy we desire to encourage is one in which changes will be implemented only if reasonable and commensurate with benefits to be gained.

In addition, the changeover will be entirely voluntary. This principle is in keeping with congressional intent to provide the greatest flexibility in conversion and to prevent excessive cost burdens being imposed on any sectors of our society.

Finally, although the Federal Government will be responsible for coordinating the overall conversion program, the initiative for both planning and the actual converting will rest with the private sector. The plan itself, in fact, will be solely the work of representatives from such diverse activities as labor, consumer affairs, education, construction, engineering-oriented industry, and the like.

Based upon these key principles, the legislation now before us reflects a changeover period of 10 years after which the United States would be predominantly, though not exclusively, metric. This 10-year period represents only a guideline however—a time period which will be the common goal of those participating in the conversion. A specific time period is also desirable in order to encourage a near-term conversion since studies have shown that it will be less costly to change the earlier the conversion proceeds.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has been studying the metric conversion for a number of years—even before the enactment of the 1968 legislation which authorized the 3-year National Bureau of Standards effort. Our conclusion which we have seen reinforced by virtually all with whom we have worked is that the United States should change to the international metric system in a deliberate and careful fashion, and that this be done through a coordinated national program. H.R. 11035 reflects the firm commitment of the Congress to a positive program for changeover. The legislation also responds to the progressive elements of our society which recognize both the inevitability and desirability of an effective, prompt, and planned conversion program.

I urge all Members of the Committee of the Whole House to agree with me in providing this bill our fullest support.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LUKEN) such time as he may consume.

(Mr. LUKEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee for giving me this time and commend him for all the effort he and his Committee have expended to bring us this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of metric conversion. And I therefore regret to oppose this bill today. I do so only because the procedures under which the bill is presented preclude a fair chance for decision on a few important issues.

First, I believe the bill as it stands is unfair to the small businessman. The costs to him that conversion will require are in many cases prohibitive because of the small profit margins he must work under. Nonetheless, small businessmen do not oppose metric conversion, nor do they demand that the Government pay their conversion costs. What they do ask for is reasonable help to see them through the transition period. Small businesses which would suffer economic injury should be allowed to take out SBA loans to cover the costs. After all, is that not what the SBA is for?

My second concern with the bill as it stands is for the worker who must maintain his own tools to do the job required by his employer. Electricians, carpenters, plumbers, and others have an enormous personal investment in their tools. It would be unfair for us to simply legislate the obsolescence of what to them is a major capital investment. It is only fair that the Government minimize the economic hardship of conversion for these workmen.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not oppose metric conversion. On the contrary, I favor it. I think this country must convert to improve opportunities for small and large business to compete with foreign producers. I believe conversion will enhance jobs and create new jobs. And I believe we must decide the issue soon so that our schools can know how to plan their lessons and so that businessmen and workers can begin to plan their conversion budgets.

But conversion must be done the proper way. A matter as important as this one must be allowed to enjoy the benefits of the full legislative process.

By defeating this bill today we will not kill conversion. We will simply let it come up another day, open to amendments and debate on those amendments. Indeed, the open rule for the bill has already been prepared.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do as I plan to do. Vote against this bill today. And then, later, we shall take it up again and debate it properly. At that time we can pass legislation for metric conversion in a way that is fair to all.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN).

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this measure. It is important and it is long overdue. I remind the Members of this House, progress does not stand still. America is not a backward country. America has always taken leadership throughout her history.

I know this bill is long overdue and should be enacted now for the benefit of commerce. Our international trade is being hampered. Our small businesses will not be damaged, but will be helped. The labor force of this country will not be damaged, but new jobs will be created. The Government of this country is aware of what must be done. This is not a handout but a helping hand.

Mainly this measure is long overdue. We must enact it and we must get started on a volunteer basis and go forward if we are to compete in the world market, and compete we must.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further request for time.

I would remind the Members of this House that we have heard a great deal of comment around here over the last few months about responsibility and the exercise of congressional perogatives. I would suggest to the Members of this House, when we promote a plan the significant impact of which has been discussed here this morning without the input, which is unrealistic, of the executive branch of this Nation, I think that constitutes a fatal defect in this legislation, and I would respectfully suggest that this bill should therefore be rejected by this House.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS), chairman of the subcommittee which has done so much work on this legislation.

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

(Mr. BURLISON of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, conversion to the metric system is a monumental step surrounded by considerable controversy. My vote today should not be interpreted as taking a position on the substantive merits of the issue. My "nay" vote merely says that the issue is too important and too controversial to be disposed of under suspension of the rules. This bill should be fully and completely debated and subject to amendment at the House's will.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If this bill made any specific demand on any sector of the economy, I could understand and maybe appreciate some of the objections made to it. This bill does not do that. It provides, after all these long years, for the creation of a plan which is then to be submitted to the Congress for approval.

There is nothing in the bill which proscribes a conversion period which such plan might recommend or the compensation to labor that the plan might recommend or indeed the total likely cost as predicted by a metric study which is 3 years old and which is not binding for 1 minute on the nature and content of the plan.

I wish to assure my colleagues that the gentleman from Iowa was not alone in his concern with the report of the General Accounting Office concerning the U.S. metric study.

When these preliminary findings were made known to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, an additional hearing was scheduled on May 10, 1973, so that we might carefully consider their possible significance with respect to the legislation then before the Subcommittee. At that time, we not only were privileged to hear the comments of the distinguished Representative from Iowa, but we also asked the Director of the National Bureau of Standards to discuss the GAO charges concerning the report prepared by that Bureau.

Let me point out, however, that the decision of our committee to recommend the particular legislation that is before you today was not based as much on the findings of the NBS study as on the very substantial rate of the changeover to metric now in progress in our country.

The GAO letter of March 27, 1973, to Representative GROSS reported three preliminary findings.

First, it was noted that the metric study report mentioned a possible $600 million increase in exports resulting from metrication, but neglected to mention a possible increase of $100 million in imports. Dr. Richard W. Roberts, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, explained that the $100 million was considered by the Bureau of Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce to be so uncertain of precise determination concerning international trade, that it was not included. Perhaps more important, he pointed out that even if the net gain of exports over imports were taken as $500 million—instead of $600 million—as of 1970 when the data were collected, the gain would be much greater today and will be even greater in the future.

The second GAO finding was that the metric study did not take into account the time value of money in its analysis of the cost of metrication by plan versus no plan. The GAO found that had this factor been considered, planned conversion would be less costly if the costs of conversion were $10 billion or less, but would be higher if conversion costs were at the $25 billion or $40 billion levels also mentioned as examples in the report. Dr. Roberts acknowledged that this more sophisticated cost analysis could lead to such a conclusion. However, he emphasized that under the metric legislation being considered by the subcommittee, the changeover to metric will be made in accord with the "rule of reason," with changes made only when the costs involved will be compensated by benefits. Under these conditions, the best available estimates indicate that the net cost of conversion should be less than $10 billion. Accordingly, the belief of the GAO that the $10 billion planned conversion would be less costly, lends added urgency to the enactment of the legislation that is before us today—which provides for planning the metric changeover now in progress in the United States.

Finally, the GAO letter suggested that the U.S. metric study did not inquire directly into the impact of metrication on small business. In his testimony on May 10, 1973, Dr. Roberts assured the subcommittee that the surveys of both manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries, which were a basic part of the study, included a substantial sampling of small business. Furthermore, well over 50 percent of the small firms surveyed increased metric usage.

It may also be significant to note that only a few days after this hearing before the Science, Research and Development Subcommittee, the General Accounting Office concluded its investigation of the NBS metric study and made no further report of its findings beyond the preliminary and tentative report that was the subject of our hearing.

Finally, of course, we must not confuse this 3-year-old study with a conversion plan which has yet to be begun much less submitted to Congress. A key element of such plan would be cost effectiveness.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation. Establishment of the metric system is long overdue.

There is a widespread notion that the change to the metric system is supported only by those in industry. However, this is not the case; let me briefly detail the widespread support for the weights and measures which is already in force in every industrialized nation in the world.

First, the changeover to metric is supported by a large number of nationally representative groups, many of which are nonindustrial and nontechnical. For example, the following major groups are definitely committed: the American Home Economics Association, representing the consumer; the National Grange, representing the farmer; and the National Education Association.

The National Education Association's support is an indication of the interest and support of our teachers. They have long been in favor of the change, primarily because the decimal nature of the metric system make it easier for them to teach and easier for the students to learn and use than our more cumbersome current measurement system. In fact, the States of California, Maryland, Michigan, Alabama, and South Carolina are now formally committed to metric education. This list is certain to grow as we move closer to metric in this country.

Finally, consumers not represented by these groups are becoming increasingly aware of the change to metric, and those that are aware of the change and understand the reasons for it largely support it.

The National Bureau of Standards reports that those consumers viewing their display on the results of the U.S. metric

study rarely express opposition to the idea of going metric, especially after viewing the world map that shows how few are the nonmetric countries today. The common response is "I had no idea we are so isolated." A growing number of the average citizens say that they are aware of the probable change to metric.

Incidentally, this growing awareness of the change is certainly due in part to the many stories about metric change that have been in the Nation's newspapers. And perhaps the positive response shown is related to the fact that metric editorials, appearing in nearly all of our newspapers over the past 2 years, are 91 percent in favor of metric, 2 percent opposed, and the remainder neutral. I doubt if many issues today can show support.

Also of interest here is a finding in a survey of consumers done by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan for the U.S. metric study. It showed that those consumers possessing accurate knowledge about metric were strongly in favor—3 to 1—of a change.

I am sure not all of our constituents are metric proponents. In fact, the University of Michigan survey showed that consumers who were not so well informed were not as enthusiastic about the change. This clearly points out the need for public education. But it also suggests that such an effort will, in fact, be successful in convincing most persons of the wisdom of a change to metric.

Thus there is much support for the change to metric from the man on the street—that is, the man on the street who has had some contact with or has some knowledge of metric units of measurement such as the meter, liter, and kilogram. And it is generally agreed that one of the first major responsibilities of the National Board this legislation will create is to do all in its power to see that all of our citizens become informed thoroughly and accurately.

Although I personally feel that this far-reaching and important legislation should be debated more fully under an open rule, it seems to me that every Member of the House should clearly express his preference on the substance of this legislation. When it comes down to a question of favoring or opposing the metric system, I cast my vote in favor of the metric system.

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few general remarks concerning conversion to the metric system. In the first place, my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii, (Mr. MATSUNAGA) pointed out that the carpenters union is opposed to this bill. For the life of me, I cannot see why a carpenter would be. There is no such thing as a metric saw. The saw will saw a board to any length one might want to saw it. There is no such thing as a metric pair of pliers. There is no such thing as a metric hammer. There is no such thing as a metric screwdriver.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman convert 2 inches into the metric system for me?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes, 50 millimeters.

Mr. GROSS. Fifty millimeters?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, that is not precise, but it is almost exact.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for such time as was consumed by laughter during the time the House was not in order.

Mr. Speaker, 1 inch is 2.54 centimeters. Two inches would be twice that amount. One-half inch, by the way, is 1.27 centimeters. That happens to be the only inch measurement that is used worldwide and they are used in the tapes of airport towers, seismographs and other tape-recording instruments all over the world. Other countries do not call it half an inch. They call it 1.27 centimeters.

What I am saying is that we are not changing the size of anything. Everything will still be the same size when we are finally on the metric system. We will just have another name for the size, that is all. Everybody will be the same height. I hope I weigh a little less than I weigh now.

What I am trying to say, it is a matter of language.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Lest the Members are left with the wrong impression that carpenters use no tools where metric conversion would be involved, the gentleman would concede there is not a steel square, there is not a try-square, there is not a rule but which needs to be converted and which the carpenters union estimated will cost its members about $350 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I cannot believe that; plus the fact we all know that a steel rule wears out, all tools wear out, and can be replaced with the metric system.

Furthermore, inches can be converted to centimeters, and so forth, by a small conversion table no larger than a credit card. The amount of trouble involved might well be compared to that which confronts a checkout clerk in a supermarket in computing the amount of sales tax due on a purchase.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House, H.R. 11035, has two purposes. One is to confirm, as a matter of national policy, a change to the metric system of weights and measures which is already well underway in this country. The other purpose of the bill is to establish a National Metric Conversion Board to assist and coordinate, on the basis of voluntary participation, the efforts of those business firms and school systems who wish to make the conversion to the metric system in the most efficient and economical manner.

Before I describe the content of this bill, Mr. Speaker, there are a few general observations which I would like to make. It is worth noting that the United States is not the only country which is making the changeover to the metric system. In the years since the end of the World War, all of the industrialized countries who in 1945 shared with us the use of the inch, the pound, and the degree Fahrenheit, have begun the process of changing to the metric system. England began in 1965, South Africa in 1966. Ireland in 1968, New Zealand in 1969, Australia in 1970, and our neighbor to the North, Canada in 1970. Each of these countries, with a substantial economy of its own, decided that it was in their interest to make this change.

The result has been that the United States today is the only industrial country which has not formally adopted a policy of changing to the metric system. The list of those countries who are in the same position is short and does not include any of our major trading partners. Barbados, Burma, Ghana, Liberia, Muscat and Oman, Nauru, Sierra Leone, Southern Yemen, and the United States of America are the only countries which have not made the decision to convert to the metric system.

But while we in this country have not formally adopted the metric system, there is abundant evidence that individual companies, schools, and other organizations have found it to their advantage to make the change to the metric system. It would be impossible for me to recite the complete list of those who have made the change, or who are now in the process of making the changeover. But let me give some examples which I think will illustrate the extent of this.

The pharmaceutical industry, with its heavy basis in scientific research, has long used the metric system. The photographic equipment industry is also a longtime user of the metric system. More recently, several companies in the computer industry including IBM and Honeywell, have announced a changeover to the metric system. In the construction equipment industry Caterpillar Tractor and Clark Equipment have announced a changeover to the metric system. Many of these firms have large export sales, but the list of firms is not limited to those with important markets abroad. In the auto industry, Ford has begun the changeover and the engine for the Pinto is already made in this country to metric measurements. General Motors announced last April that all new development projects would be carried forward on metric rather than in the customary units of measurement, and the many suppliers of auto parts will be following GM's lead. In the farm equipment industry the John Deere Co., the Massey Ferguson Co., and the International Harvester Co. have begun the change to the metric system.

Perhaps most notable of all, the schools of America, have begun to teach the metric system, although it is still only in small numbers. Request for copies of the committee hearings have come from a number of teachers and principals who want to introduce this subject in their schools, and the State boards of education in California, Maryland, and Michigan have announced that their textbooks

are to include the metric system no later than 1976.

These examples show, Mr. Speaker, that in many areas of our society where weights and measures are used or taught, the change to the metric system has begun. Furthermore, most of these decisions to change to the metric system have been made in the last few years and the number of such decisions is increasing fast. The testimony heard by the committee indicated that there was wide agreement on the desirability of going forward with the changeover. Furthermore, it become apparent that many firms who are now considering conversion are only awaiting a firm statement by the Congress and the President committing the United States to the conversion to the metric system, before they, too, adopt the metric system.

In the United States the choice before us is, therefore, not whether to go metric or remain with the customary system of measures. The changeover has begun and is now in the early stages. The choice before us is whether we shall continue to make the changeover in an entirely uncoordinated fashion as we are doing now, or whether the Federal Government should assist in coordinating the changeover to the metric system and thus make it more efficient and less costly.

And that brings me to the question of costs. In recent days there have been suggestions that the cost of going metric would be very high, and several rather astronomical figures have been mentioned. The committee made a close examination of this question and arrived at several conclusions. First of all, the $50 or $60 billion figures which have been mentioned are based on changing everything without regard to need or economic merit. Such an approach is neither feasible or desirable, and the cost estimates based on that approach are therefore entirely unrealistic.

This bill provides that the costs of metrication shall "lie where they fall." This is the principle which has been followed by the other countries which have changed to the metric system, and which was recommended by the U.S. metric study. This principle, rather than a program of Federal subsidies, provide a strong incentive to minimizing costs, and will insure that the change to the metric system will be done in the most efficient and least wasteful manner. If industry makes the change when and where it is called for based on its own judgment of the costs and benefits, it will have a strong incentive to hold down costs. Furthermore, the timing of the changeover will strongly affect costs. No one would argue that a perfectly good machine tool be scrapped simply in order to replace it with a new one built to metric standards. Instead, the dials on the existing tool will be replaced at a fractional cost, and eventually, when the tool wears out or becomes uneconomical to operate, it will be replaced with a new metric tool. The bulk of the cost of the new tool will then be replacement costs, not metric costs.

However, this is not to say that the cost of making the change to the metric system will be negligible. They will be substantial, and an important purpose of the bill is to reduce the total cost to American society. The bill would achieve a reduction in the cost of metrication in two ways: One, by providing a mechanism for the voluntary coordination of the changeover, and two, by reducng the length of time which the conversion will take. The coordination function of the Board is based on the experience of several of the other countries now making the change. The Board would bring together each sector of American industry on a voluntary basis to assist them in developing the new metric standards that would be needed and the time schedule on which the changeover could be made.

No one would be bound to the 10-year period over which the Board would be in existence. Some sectors of industry may find it best to make the conversion in a shorter period of time. Others may decide that a longer period, such as 12 or 14 years, is best for them. In that case they would have the benefit of assistance by the Board for the first 10 years, and would then have to make the conversion over the remaining 4 years on their own. In any case the coordination function of the Board will serve to reduce confusion, cut dual inventories, and lessen the mismatching of components, and, as a result, would reduce the total cost to the American economy.

The bill provides that the National Metric Conversion Board shall consist of 21 members, appointed by the President, and that the members shall be broadly representative of industry, labor, the consumer, education, and other affected groups. The first function of the Board shall be the preparation of plan for its future work. This plan shall be submitted to the Congress where it can be disapproved in whole or in part by a vote in either House. The Board would have would accomplish its educational and co no compulsory powers whatever, and ordination work entirely through voluntary participation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves the support of every Member.

A summary of the benefits and costs analysis and a telegram follow:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
AND ASTRONAUTICS,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1974.

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Committee on Science and Astronoutics.
From: John Holmfeld, Staff.
Subject: Costs and Benefits of the Metric System.

During the current consideration of the Metric Bill, H.R. 11035, which was reported out by the Committee on Science and Astronautics on October 23rd, 1973, a number of questions related to the Metric system have been discussed.

At the request of several members of the Committee, a summary of the estimates of costs and benefits developed by the U.S. Metric Study, and contained in the report "A Metric America", has been prepared and is attached for your information.

THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF METRIC CONVERSION

(A Summary of the Benefits and Costs Analysis in the U.S. Metric Study, Prepared by the Staff, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives. February 19, 1974)

SUMMARY

Conversion to the Metric Systems in the United States will involve substantial costs as well as large benefits. The U.S. Metric Study concluded that over the long run the benefits would outweigh the costs. Furthermore, the Study found that the costs could be reduced and the benefits would come sooner if the Metric Conversion was done in a coordinated, as opposed to an uncoordinated fashion. However, both benefits and costs are difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy.

BENEFITS OF METRICATION

The benefits of Metrication are especially difficult to measure in dollars and cents. The U.S. Metric Study asked a large number of firms, including many who are making the Metric changeover now, to provide estimates of the benefits expected. Few were able to provide a dollar figure for the expected benefits. This is because some of the benefits are intangible and will never be measurable, because the benefits will come some time in the future and are not, like the costs, confined to a short period of time, and because some benefits can not be attributed exclusively to the Metric changeover.

Direct benefit

The benefit which is expected from Metrication is first and foremost that Metric is a simpler system. It has fewer units of measurement, it is easier for schoolchildren to learn, and it is easier for everyone to use in making calculations.

Indirect benefits

The U.S. Metric Study found that a number of indirect, but very real benefits would arise from converting to the Metric system. These benefits include the reduction in the number of different parts made and kept in stock as a result of the adoption of Metric standards (For example, in Britain the number of standard nuts and bolts was reduced from 400 to 200 and the number of ball bearing types from 280 to 30), compatibility with the military equipment of our allies, time available to schoolteachers to teach other subjects, and greater ease for housewives in using the unit pricing system in supermarkets.

Balance of trade

The one type of benefit for which Dollar estimates were made is the effect of Metrication on the U.S. balance of trade. The Metric study concluded that sales of American products abroad would increase annually by approximately $600 million, and that imports would increase by approximately $100 million for a total net benefit to the balance of trade of approximately $500 million per year.

COSTS OF METRICATION

It is not as difficult to place a Dollar figure on the cost of Metrication as it is to put a Dollar figure on the benefits. However, estimates of costs are still highly uncertain and vary greatly depending on the assumptions used and the manner in which the costs are charged off. The U.S. Metric Study concluded that conversion to the Metric system in the United States will be expensive and that a program for coordinating the changeover could reduce the total cost.

Rule of reason

The U.S. Metric Study recommended that in making the changeover the "Rule of Rea-

son" be applied. The Rule of Reason means that costs should not be incurred unless there are corresponding benefits. In the case of Metrication it means that no machine or piece of equipment should be replaced solely for the purpose of making the change to the Metric System. Rather, a machine should be replaced when it wears out or when, for any other reason, it become uneconomical to operate. At that time the changeover to the Metric System for that machine should take place and only the additional cost of buying a Metric machine as opposed to a machine with the customary system (if any) should then be charged as a Metrication cost.

An extreme example of the application of the Rule of Reason is that railroad tracks should not be torn up simply for the purpose of making the distance between the rails exactly one meter. It will probably never be economical to make that change. An actual example of the application of the Rule of Reason is found in the case of school textbooks. The cost of printing and issuing new textbooks throughout the U.S. simply to make a change to the Metric System would be large, according to some estimates about $1 billion. However, textbooks are reissued on the average of every four years. If the change to Metric is made at the time the textbooks are changed anyway, the cost attributable to Metrication would be very small.

Two types of costs

The cost of making the Metric changeover involves two types of costs: The direct, "out-of-pocket" costs and the indirect, or "esper" costs. Direct costs are those costs attributable solely to Metric Conversion. Examples of direct costs are: A Metric highway sign, a Metric dial on a machine tool, a metric micrometer, and the cost of carrying a dual inventory. An indirect cost is a cost arising indirectly from the changeover to Metric. Examples of indirect costs are: The cost of worker training, the costs of mistakes, the temporary loss to workers on piece work. Indirect costs frequently are difficult to measure in Dollars and Cents.

The manufacturing sector

By far the largest cost impact of Metrication will be felt in the manufacturing sector. Several estimates of the costs of Metrication in this sector were made and they differ because the assumptions on which they are based differ.

The $25 Billion Cost Estimate. In response to a request for detailed cost estimates from 4,000 U.S. manufacturing companies, the U.S. Metric Study received 126 such estimates. The analysis of these responses and a simple extrapolation to all U.S. industry led to a total cost estimate of $25 billion. However, this extrapolation assumes that the 126 firms are typical of the more than 300,000 industrial firms in the U.S. The U.S. Metric Study concluded that this was not the case. For example, a single large mining and refining company had cost estimates which were much higher than those anticipated by similar firms. If this single estimate was omitted from the extrapolation, the total estimate was reduced by $3 billion to $22 billion. The U.S. Metric Study therefore performed a more complex, but also more valid analysis of the same data which led to the following estimate.

The $10 Billion Estimate. A statistical analysis of the 126 responses mentioned above was made. This analysis eliminated, insofar as possible, the lack of representativeness in the responses and the overestimates found in some of the estimates. The analysis led to the finding that the costs for the manufacturing sector should lie between a high of $14.3 billion and a low of $3.2 billion. The approximate midpoint between these two figures is $10 billion.

The nonmanufacturing sector

Non-manufacturing companies were asked to estimate how Metric conversion would increase their annual cost of doing business. The majority estimated that their expenses would rise by about one half of one percent during the changeover period. When extended to the country as a whole, this would mean a total cost of about $1 billion per year or roughly $10 billion for the 10 year conversion period.

Cost of dual inventories

Many U.S. companies would have to maintain a dual inventory of spare parts. For the 10-year period the cost is estimated at $5 billion, or $500 million per year. In some businesses, such as auto repair firms, this cost is already being incurred. A longer conversion period would extend this annual cost.

The Federal Government

The cost of adopting the Metric system by the Federal Government was made in two parts; one part covered the Department of Defense, and the other covered all other agencies.

Defense Department Cost Estimate. The estimate made for the U.S. Metric Study by the Department of Defense (DOD) (Interim Report No. 9) amounted to $18 billion. This cost estimate is based on several assumptions which were not used in making cost estimates for the Manufacturing sector and other sectors. It is therefore a good deal higher than it would be if such assumptions as the "Rule of Reason" had been applied.

The assumption used in the DOD estimate was that the Metric Conversion will be made on a "directed" basis. For example, modification of the 144,000 machine tools in the DOD Industrial Plant Equipment Center would be made regardless of immediate needs. This is estimated at a cost of $115 million, and that total cost is included in the total DOD estimate. In some areas of technology, such as aircraft engines, the U.S. has been predominant throughout the world, and customary units are therefore used in many countries outside the U.S. The DOD study assumes that in these fields of technology a total conversion will be made. In sum, the DOD study assumes that the Metric system will be mandatory in all DOD activities after the conclusion of the 10-year changeover period, except for spare parts.

The Rest of the Federal Government. The other 55 departments and agencies that were surveyed were much more optimistic about costs. Conversion expenses over ten years would be about $600 million. This would amount to 30 cents per capita per year, and after the conclusion of the ten year conversion period the annual savings were estimated at 11 percent of the total conversion costs.

The $60 billion cost estimate

The estimate of $60 billion for U.S. Metrication, which appears in some discussions of this subject, was arrived at by adding the $25 billion estimate for the manufacturing sector, the $18 billion estimate for the Department of Defense, the $10 billion estimate for the non-manufacturing industry and the $5 billion for the cost of dual inventories. This results in a total of $58 billion which is then brought to $60 billion by estimating that all other costs will amount to $2 billion.

The $60 billion estimate is an estimate of what a Metric conversion would cost if, over a 10-year period, a total conversion was made, and all costs of replacing tools, equipment and facilities were charged solely to the Metric conversion. As noted in discussing the rule of reason above this is not a reasonable way to charge Metrication costs and does not reflect the actual changeover practices now being followed by those firms, school districts, and others who are now actually making the changeover.

COMPARISON OF COSTS AND BENEFITS

The U.S. Metric Study concluded that a clear-cut balance sheet comparing benefits and costs of metrication could not be developed. This is due to the inability to measure benefits in dollars and cents and due to the uncertainty attached to the cost estimates.

The study found that the choice before the Congress and the country is not whether to go Metric or not. Schools, commerce, and industry in the U.S. have begun to adopt the Metric system in increasing numbers. The choice therefore is whether the changeover shall continue on an uncoordinated, firm-by-firm and school-by-school basis, as is now the case, or whether a modest effort of voluntary coordination shall be made.

Based on this finding the Metric Study concluded that the most meaningful analysis of the cost question would consist of a comparison of the costs of conversion over a 10-year period and the costs of conversion over a much longer period. For study purposes a 50-year period was used.

Using the same assumptions for both time periods the Metric Study found that a coordinated changeover aimed at making the U.S. "predominantly, but not exclusively" metric over a 10-year period would reduce the total cost to the U.S. economy.

[Telegram]

MAY 2, 1974.

Hon. JOHN W. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The National Education Association supports H.R. 11035, conversion your support in achieving final passage of this bill, which is a major step in resolving this extremely important nationa lissue.

STANLEY J. MCFARLAND,
Director of Government Relations, National Education Association.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I shall supoprt H.R. 11035, the metric conversion bill, with some misgivings.

The growth in use of metric measures in this country has been significant. The growth will continue whether or not we pass this bill. Since the bill does not impose mandatory conversion, is wholly voluntary, and is intended to provide coordination and leadership to the inevitable development of the metric system, it seems to be a pretty safe piece of legislation.

The complaints from small business groups would seem to be answered by the dialog between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Science and Astronautics Committee. If holdups are forced by this bill, which seems an unlikely prospect, small businesses should be protected by loans through SBA. I believe that any businesses, large or small, or any employee would be better served under the bill, than under a system of random growth of the metric system.

With some national leadership, on the other hand, both export-oriented and domestically oriented firms will get better guidance to make their conclusions, if they choose to do so, in the manner that serves their interests best.

I am sorry the bill has been handled under suspension. This is a bad procedure. We should have an opportunity to amend. But, even under the procedure I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, if H.R. 11035 passes, American farmers 10 years hence will be reporting their crop yield as X number of hectoliters. The prospective buyers, who a few years earlier were quite comfortable thinking in terms of bushels, will quickly multiply X hectoliters by

2.84 thereby revealing Y numbers of bushels.

In 10 years the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may well hire an army of mathematicians to translate the nebulous world of OSHA regulations into unfamiliar metric measurements.

Small businessmen and American workers will have shoveled out much of their narrow profit margin for new instruments and tools of every kind.

And everyone will have purchased a calculator to figure out everything from body temperature to the amount of flour for a recipe.

The justification for metric conversion is, of course, to keep American industry in a competitive position with metrical industrial powers. But we must realize that if it will be easier for Americans to sell American products abroad, it will also be easier for other nations to sell foreign products in America. And as a GAO report pointed out, the added costs of metric conversion will actually make U.S. exports more costly and place these products at even more of a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis the products of foreign firms that are already metric.

Another GAO report last year estimated that we may expect that U.S. exports will increase by a total of $5 billion during the 10-year conversion period. But when compared to the staggering estimated cost to convert—$45 to $100 billion—the trade advantages look less attractive.

If we do opt for the metric system we should decide how we can convert with a minimum of inconvenience and cost. As the GAO has indicated, a 10-year conversion will be far more costly than a gradual and voluntary conversion.

I think we can learn from the British experience. Six years after conversion, a Gallup poll shows that 57 percent of the British people oppose the metric system. If disenchantment is this high in a nation tied to the metrically oriented Common Market, it is doubtful whether America will convert more smoothly—especially when, as indicated by a National Bureau of Standards report, 60 percent of the American people are totally unfamiliar with the metric system.

I am most concerned about the 5,200,000 small businessmen and millions of American skilled workers who do not have the resources of large corporations to absorb the expense of remeasuring all aspects of their businesses. Conversion will be a nonproductive expense for all businesses, but it will be worse for small businesses because they are minimaly involved in foreign trade, and hence the cost conversion offers no ultimate benefit in increased business. The cost of metric conversion for the small businessman will therefore be doubly unjustified: it will be nonproductive, and it will not result in an expanded market.

The 10-year crash program may well be financially disastrous for small businessmen and American workers. As small businesses fold, the large corporations would gobble up the old markets of the small businessmen, and business ownership would be greatly concentrated.

If there is real need for small businesses—as opposed to glant International corporations—to convert, then they will do so as the need arises, gradually and naturally. It makes no sense to force them to convert against their will.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the committee has heard a lot of emotionally charged rhetoric that somehow we Americans are lagging behind the entire world because we have not converted to metric. I would simply remind the Members that we are the only country that has put a man on the moon—not once, but numerous times. And this was done by the inch, pound, foot system—not by metric. Also, I have never heard of any of these other progressive countries turning down our aircraft, tanks, or other sophisticated weaponry or refusing our agricultural products because they were harvested and packaged by the pound, bushel, or short ton.

As for the charges that unless we convert to metric, we will lose our international markets, one need only to look at the foreign automobiles on our streets and the foreign goods and materials in our stores to question whether the market we are losing is overseas under metric or here at home from foreign imports converted to the inch, foot, pound system.

The proposed National Metric Conversion Act, which we are discussing today, to coordinate the "voluntary conversion" to the one-world, metric system is deserving of a great deal of serious consideration before we attempt to impose it on the American public. It is, after all, a revolutionary concept to our people who are accustomed to thinking in terms of feet, inches, pounds, miles-per-hour, et cetera—the American system.

The metric system has been authorized for use in the United States since 1866, yet except in the scientific and related fields, the average citizen has not converted to the metric system as a means of communication. Metric remains an alien language, probably because it is incompatible with our every-day lives and is of little practical benefit. Or, it might be said, the average American feels if the present system works, why change it simply for the benefit of change.

There has been so much hoopla in the press suggesting that national conversion to a foreign measurement system is an "inevitable reform" that many of our colleagues seem to accept this as a foregone conclusion. We must examine some of the realities of this legislation before we move to hastily impose a foreign measurement on our people after almost 200 years of successful use of a proven system of measurement communication.

One great concern is the effect of this legislation on small businesses in America doing business with Americans. Truly, passage of this bill will only further the old adage that "the big boys get richer and the small boys get poorer." Succinctly, as Mr. George C. Lovel points out in his forthcoming book, "The Coming Metric Disaster"—

If one cannot produce to metric specifications as would be required by Government Contract (by 1985), or is competitively placed at a disadvantage with his giant counterparts, then he voluntarily closes shop or goes bankrupt.

What I am saying is that we have only recently seen the tragic effect of the energy crisis on small businesses; this will again be the case if this Congress sees fit to enact measurement control legislation. Language, like economics, should be free—left to the people, not to political edict.

My residence lot is 100 times 175 feet or 17,500 square feet. It took me one second to compute this because of the multiple 10 idea—but it was not metric. Our monetary system is decimalized, but it is not metric. In metric, my lot is 30.48 times 53.34 meters or 1624.8032 square meters. A lot 88 times 110 feet would be 9680 square feet or 26.9984 times 33.528 meters which comes to 95.450552 square meters. Metric proponents claim simplicity. That all one needs to do is more the decimal back and forth—don't you believe it. When you think of all the parcels of land all over the country and all the real estate transactions recorded in the public records, one can envision somewhat the confusion metric would provoke. And that is only the beginning. Think of all the land surveys, and distances based on the mile from a central point in Washington, D.C.—the official land tracts based on a mile square—the maps and the distances between places; and try to convert to metric remembering that 1 mile equals 1,609,344 meters. In cubic measurements, one usually has an answer with 12 decimals; thus, a 2 inch cube, or 8 cubic inches, ends up as 0.000131096512 cubic meters.

To get around this decimal problem, metric has a table of 15 prefixes. Thus, the above cube would be 131,09512 tetra meters, or is it nano, or giga, or micro? This leads to another flaw in the metric wonderland—the "teaching math is easier" syndrome.

Because we cannot get rid of inch-based things which surround us, we will need to learn both systems—on top of these add the layer of 15 prefixes which must be taught, memorized and understood. There are other deeper and more subtle problems to the metric educational fallacy which England now is discovering to her dismay. One educator contends that fractions will no longer be taught and this theme was touted in one of the world's most widely read digest. They may be beating a dead horse, however, a music teacher friend of mine observed. He reports that fractions may have already been deleted from the curriculum for most teenagers today are unable to comprehend or relate to the simplest half-notes, quarter-notes, eighths, and sixteenths.

Additionally, it is not clear what the effect of this legislation will be on American companies operating in competition with foreign firms. Quoting Mr. Lovell—

As U.S. producers switch to metric standards, the U.S. trade deficit will grow sharply because the competitive advantage will swing further to foreign producers who will have had production experience with such standards, whereas U.S. producers will have to acquire it and educate U.S. consumers to accept it. There will be added costs to U.S. producers from retooling, double inventories, errors due to unfamiliarity with the new system, and costs arising from the necessity to continue producing to the old specifications for many years to service existing inch-based equipment. These added

costs would automatically give the foreign metric-based producers an additional cost advantage by opening the gates to a "new" flood of exports into this country.

It may prove acceptable to foreign consumers but of serious long-term impact on the real world market—the U.S. consumers.

The true effect of this legislation on American consumers is not clear. Certainly, the primary problem stems from the fact that it will be impossible to get rid of the inch-foot based things around us. Some of the adverse results of this will be economic; others will be financial, and some will be political. In each case, the American people will be faced with endless inconveniences and confusion, which in some cases could expect to be with us for centuries.

Proponents of this legislation argue that the United States alone in the world is the only country that has not established a national policy on converting to the metric system. This is really a rather tenuous argument. After all, this is the greatest country in the world, with the greatest technology. If the scientists want to use the metric system, then they certainly have the freedom to do so; however, it seems unconscionable to ask the carpenter, farmer, real estate agent, or consumer to change to the metric system, including bearing the cost of the conversion, simply because the scientists, intellectuals and multinational business interests feel that it would be advantageous to them for foreign trade—especially since the world market has already accepted and is using the U.S. system.

One of the great advantages of life in America is that its people are so diverse. I know that the Members would hesitate to change the language of our society from English to, say, Esparanto or Swahili simply for the proposed benefit of international trade. It is, I suggest, just as troublesome to pass legislation such as that before us, which proposes an international one-world measurement for use in America.

I know our people may not understand this bill before us today but they will next year and the years thereafter if it should pass. As for me, I am an American. I am satisfied with America and our system which has and is serving our people well. I shall cast my people's vote against this legislation and I urge my colleagues to join in opposing this anti-American legislation.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am voting "no" on this bill although I would vote "yes" if it were to come up under the regular parliamentary procedure. I believe, however, that no controversial bill, and this measure is controversial, should be brought to the floor under the suspension calendar which limits debate to only 40 minutes and bars the offering of any amendments. I urge my good friend, Mr. TEAGUE, chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, to bring this bill up under the rule already provided by the Rules Committee and let the House work its will.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the Metric Conversion Act, which we have before us, is an important proposal for improving the American system of weights and measures by conforming it to the systems of other nations. It will undoubtedly facilitate international exchanges in a number of areas, as well as achieve certain domestic benefits.

To be sure, conversion has already been undertaken in some sectors of the Nation. The scientific community has used the metric system for a number of years, and students studying science, at whatever level, have worked with it. Thus the act really seeks to promote and encourage its wider use, rather than introduce a totally unfamiliar system into the United States.

In my judgment, conversion to the metric system has two principal advantages. First, the system, based on the number 10, is easier to use than our system. Anyone who has attempted any type of calculation involving weights and measures is aware of the difficulties of our present arrangement.

From the grammar school student to the supermarket shopper, the daily struggles with ounces and pounds, inches and feet, are very frustrating. Since our monetary system is based on 10, it is foolish not to use weights and measures based on the same decimal. The consumer would benefit greatly under the new system, as well as the pupil striving for comprehension, notwithstanding the new math.

Furthermore, the metric system is nearly universal among the nations of the world. Our conversion to that system would be very helpful for our international exchanges.

The difficulties I have with the Metric Conversion Act, as presented to us today, do not go to its underlying purpose. My objection is that the bill is here under a suspension of the rules, allowing no amendments. That is too stifling a manner in which to consider this important measure. This is particularly true since the Rules Committee has already granted an open rule when the proposal comes up in the regular course of business.

While the principal thrust of the bill is exemplary, there are a few provisions that might well benefit by amendment. For example, the act appears to preclude the use of Federal aid to assist the voluntary conversion to the metric system. Those directives, it seems to me, are too inflexible.

The National Metric Conversion Board, which this bill would establish, will be devising a master conversion plan over the next 12 months. It is very possible that, as the Board focuses on the practical problems associated with the conversion, Federal financial assistance may be necessary. It seems to me that we should not foreclose the Board from including in its plan or recommending to the Congress a conversion program which calls for Federal subsidies, whether in the form of loans, grants, tax deductions, or other incentives.

I can envision that small businesses and workers would particularly feel the economic impact of the conversion. Persons who are employed in the crafts or as mechanics might well have to invest in new tools. Companies which metricate will surely have to purchase new equipment or convert their old machinery to the new system. If it is in the national interest to change to the metric system, it is surely in the national interest to ease the financial burdens which accompany it.

It goes almost without saying that it is important to complete the conversion process at the earliest practicable date. We should not tarry over the consideration of this measure. It has been over 100 years, however, since Congress first authorized the use of the metric system. Thus to debate final passage using the extraordinary procedure of a suspension seems to me a bit hasty in light of this history. The more prudent course, I suggest, is to await the return of the Metric Conversion Act to the floor under the rule authorized by our committee.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, as one who has cosponsored similar legislation with Congressman MCCLORY, I would just like to add my support to H.R. 11035, the Metric System Conversion Act. The purpose of this bill is to declare and implement voluntary conversion to the metric system within the next 10 years.

Under the metric system, all units have a uniform relationship—which is based upon the decimal. The meter—which roughly corresponds to our yard—is the principal unit. All measures of capacity, surface, volume, and weight are derived from it. The scale of subdivisions and multiples is 10.

As far back as 1866, the U.S. Congress legalized the metric system, and a few years later the United States was a party to "the Treaty of the Meter." By signing this treaty, our country, along with every other major country in the world, endorsed the metric system as "the internationally preferred system of weights and measures." However, our Government then made no concerted effort to authorize a program to actually provide for the conversion to such a system.

In 1965, Great Britain began implementing the metric system. Since at that time the United States was about the only industrialized nation not using metric units, Congress was prompted to reevaluate our position. Hearings were held which led to the eventual enactment of legislation directing the Secretary of Commerce to study the desirability of increasing the use of the metric system in our country. To carry out this directive, an advisory panel was set up, composed of persons who represented all walks of life. In part, the summary of their findings read:

> . . . eventually the United States will join the rest of the world in the use of the metric system as the predominant common language of measurement. Rather than drifting to metric with no national plan to help the sectors of our society and guide our relationships abroad, a carefully planned transition in which all sectors participate voluntarily is preferable. The change will not come quickly, nor will it be without difficulty; but Americans working cooperatively can resolve this question once and for all.

I think it is clear from this report that we must proceed in an orderly manner with metric conversion. In addition, the metric system is in itself desirable for a number of reasons.

First, it is already used by our Government for several purposes, including tariff matters and weighing foreign mail.

Second, many private industries use metric measures. Deere & Co., which has offices in my congressional district, began its own conversion nearly 10 years ago—using dual dimensions in many of their technical drawings. In fact, at least 10 percent of all U.S. manufacturers currently use the metric system, and 90 percent prefer a coordinated policy on this matter. Ford Motor Corp. will soon produce our first entirely metric automobile engine. And the pharmaceutical industry and the medical profession already use such measurements.

Perhaps the most compelling argument in favor of the metric system, however, is in regard to our trading position. At a time of integrated commerce which has been of such benefit to American businessmen and farmers—and in turn the American consumer—it is only prudent for the United States to adjust its systems to those internationally accepted. By 1978, nonmetric products are not even expected to be allowed to enter the European Economic Community, so the metric system seems clearly in our own best interests.

The bill before us today will provide for conversion in an orderly, thorough manner. It recognizes the need of coordination, voluntary participation, and the importance of education about the system itself. Very briefly, H.R. 11035 sets up a board to devise an appropriate program which must be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce within a year. The Secretary would then, along with his own recommendations, submit this plan to the Congress for final approval. While I preferred the bill I originally cosponsored as it provided for a more immediate commitment, H.R. 11035 does have an advantage of insuring careful planning on an action which will virtually affect every American citizen. I therefore urge immediate enactment of the Metric System Conversion Act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11035.

The question was taken.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 153, nays 240, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—153

Adams	Broyhill, Va.	Davis, Wis.
Alexander	Buchanan	de la Garza
Anderson, Ill.	Burgener	Dellenback
Andrews, N.C.	Burleson, Tex.	Dellums
Ashley	Casey, Tex.	Denholm
Aspin	Cederberg	Dorn
Bell	Chamberlain	Downing
Bennett	Cohen	du Pont
Bergland	Conable	Edwards, Ala.
Biester	Conte	Edwards, Calif.
Boggs	Conyers	Esch
Boland	Corman	Fascell
Bolling	Cotter	Fisher
Brademas	Coughlin	Foley
Breaux	Cronin	Forsythe
Brooks	Danielson	Fraser
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Ga.	Frenzel
Frey	Mathis, Ga.	Shipley
Fuqua	Mayne	Smith, Iowa
Gettys	Meeds	Smith, N.Y.
Giaimo	Michel	Steelman
Gibbons	Milford	Stratton
Goldwater	Miller	Symington
Griffiths	Mink	Teague
Gubser	Minshall, Ohio	Tiernan
Gude	Montgomery	Towell, Nev.
Gunter	Mosher	Udall
Hamilton	Moss	Ullman
Hanna	O'Hara	Van Deerlin
Hanrahan	O'Neill	Vander Jagt
Hansen, Idaho	Owens	Veysey
Harrington	Pettis	Waldie
Hechler, W. Va.	Pike	Ware
Heinz	Poage	Whalen
Hicks	Powell, Ohio	White
Hogan	Preyer	Wiggins
Hosmer	Pritchard	Wilson,
Howard	Quie	Charles, Tex.
Ichord	Quillen	Winn
Kastenmeier	Railsback	Wolff
Landrum	Rees	Wyatt
Lent	Rhodes	Wydler
Long, La.	Robison, N.Y.	Wylie
McClory	Roncalio, Wyo.	Yates
McCloskey	Rostenkowski	Young, Alaska
McCormack	Roush	Young, Fla.
McEwen	Ruppe	Young, Ill.
McKay	Ryan	Young, S.C.
McKinney	Sarasin	Young, Tex.
Mallary	Schneebeli	Zablocki
Mann	Schroeder	
Maraziti	Seiberling	

NAYS—240

Abdnor	Donohue	Lott
Abzug	Drinan	Luken
Addabbo	Dulski	McCollister
Anderson, Calif.	Duncan	McDade
Andrews, N. Dak.	Eckhardt	McFall
Annunzio	Edberg	McSpadden
Archer	Erlenborn	Madigan
Arends	Eshleman	Mahon
Armstrong	Evans, Colo.	Martin, Nebr.
Ashbrook	Evins, Tenn.	Mathias, Calif.
Badillo	Findley	Matsunaga
Bafalis	Fish	Mazzoli
Baker	Flood	Melcher
Barrett	Flynt	Metcalfe
Bauman	Ford	Mezvinsky
Beard	Fountain	Minish
Biaggi	Froehlich	Mitchell, Md.
Bingham	Fulton	Mitchell, N.Y.
Blackburn	Gaydos	Mizell
Bowen	Gilman	Moakley
Brasco	Ginn	Mollohan
Bray	Gonzalez	Moorhead, Calif.
Brecklnridge	Goodling	Moorhead, Pa.
Brinkley	Grasso	Murphy, Ill.
Broomfield	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Green, Pa.	Murtha
Brown, Mich.	Gross	Myers
Broyhill, N.C.	Grover	Natcher
Burke, Calif.	Guyer	Nedzi
Burke, Fla.	Hammer-schmidt	Nelsen
Burke, Mass.	Hanley	Obey
Burlison, Mo.	Harsha	O'Brien
Burton	Hastings	Parris
Butler	Hawkins	Passman
Byron	Hays	Patten
Camp	Hébert	Pepper
Carter	Heckler, Mass.	Perkins
Chappell	Henderson	Peyser
Chisholm	Hillis	Podell
Clancy	Hinshaw	Price, Ill.
Clark	Holt	Price, Tex.
Clausen, Don H.	Holtzman	Randall
Clawson, Del	Horton	Rangel
Clay	Huber	Rarick
Cleveland	Hudnut	Regula
Cochran	Hungate	Reuss
Collier	Hunt	Riegle
Collins, Ill.	Hutchinson	Rinaldo
Collins, Tex.	Jarman	Roberts
Conlan	Johnson, Calif.	Robinson, Va.
Crane	Jones, Okla.	Rodino
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Roe
Daniel, Dan	Jordan	Rogers
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Daniels, Dominick V.	Kazen	Rosenthal
Davis, S.C.	Kemp	Rousselot
Delaney	Ketchum	Roy
Dennis	King	Roybal
Dent	Kluczynski	Runnels
Derwinski	Koch	Ruth
Devine	Kuykendall	St Germain
Dickinson	Kyros	Sarbanes
Diggs	Lagomarsino	Satterfield
Dingell	Landgrebe	Scherle
	Latta	Sebelius
	Lehman	Shoup
	Litton	Shriver
	Long, Md.	Shuster
Sikes	Sullivan	Whitehurst
Skubitz	Symms	Whitten
Slack	Talcott	Widnall
Snyder	Taylor, Mo.	Williams
Spence	Taylor, N.C.	Wilson, Bob
Staggers	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson,
Stanton, J. William	Thomson, Wis.	Charles H., Calif.
Stark	Thone	Wright
Steed	Traxler	Wyman
Steele	Vander Veen	Yatron
Steiger, Ariz.	Vanik	Zion
Stelger, Wis.	Vigorito	Zwach
Stuckey	Waggonner	
Studds	Walsh	
	Wampler	

NOT VOTING—40

Bevill	Jones, Ala.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Blatnik	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.
Brotzman	Leggett	Rose
Carey, N.Y.	Lujan	Sandman
Carney, Ohio	Macdonald	Sisk
Flowers	Madden	Stanton, James V.
Frelinghuysen	Martin, N.C.	Stephens
Green, Oreg.	Mills	Stokes
Haley	Morgan	Stubblefield
Hansen, Wash.	Nichols	Thornton
Helstoski	Nix	Treen
Holifield	Patman	Young, Ga.
Johnson, Colo.	Pickle	
Johnson, Pa.	Reid	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Carney of Ohio.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Martin of North Carolina.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Thornton.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Rose.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Bevill.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Macdonald.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. James V. Stanton.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Young of Georgia.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Sandman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' AND SURVIVORS' COMPENSATION INCREASES

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14117) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans, and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for their survivors, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14117

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$28" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$31";

(2) by striking out "$51" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$57";

(3) by striking out "$77" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$86";

(4) by striking out "$106" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "$122";

(5) by striking out "$149" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "$171";
(6) by striking out "$179" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "$211";
(7) by striking out "$212" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "$250";
(8) by striking out "$245" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "$289";
(9) by striking out "$275" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "$325".
(10) by striking out "$495" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "$584";
(11) by striking out "$47" and "$616" and "$862" in subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof "$52" and "$727" and "$1,017" respectively.
(12) by striking out "$616" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "$727";
(13) by striking out "$678" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "$800";
(14) by striking out "$770" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "$909";
(15) by striking out "$862" in subsections (o) and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,017";
(16) by striking out "$370" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "$437"; and
(17) by striking out "$554" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "$654".

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this section, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. Section 315(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$31" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "$36";
(2) by striking out "$53" in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "$61";
(3) by striking out "$67" in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "$77";
(4) by striking out "$83" and "$15" in subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "$95" and "$17", respectively;
(5) by striking out "$21" in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "$24";
(6) by striking out "$36" in subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "$41";
(7) by striking out "$53" and "$15" in subparagraph (G) and inserting in lieu thereof "$61" and "$17", respectively;
(8) by striking out "$25" in subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "$29"; and
(9) by striking out "$48" in subparagraph (I) and inserting in lieu thereof "$55".

SEC. 3. Section 411 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid to a widow, based on the pay grade of her deceased husband, at monthly rates set forth in the following table:

"Pay grade	Monthly rate
E-1	$215
E-2	221
E-3	228
E-4	241
E-5	248
E-6	254
E-7	266
E-8	281
E-9	*294
W-1	271
W-2	282
W-3	291
W-4	307
O-1	271
O-2	281
O-3	301
O-4	318
O-5	350
O-6	394
O-7	427
O-8	467
O-9	502
O-10	*549

"*If the veteran served as sergeant major of the Army, senior enlisted advisor of the Navy, chief master sergeant of the Air Force, sergeant major of the Marine Corps, or master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the widow's rate shall be $316.

"*If the veteran served as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the widow's rate shall be $589.

"(b) If there is a widow with one or more children below the age of eighteen of a deceased veteran, the dependency and indemnity compensation paid monthly to the widow shall be increased by $26 for each such child.

"(c) The monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to a widow shall be increased by $64 if she is (1) a patient in a nursing home or (2) helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person.".

SEC. 4. Section 413 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever there is no widow of a deceased veteran entitled to dependency and indemnity compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid in equal shares to the children of the deceased veteran at the following monthly rates:

"(1) One child, $108.
"(2) Two children, $156.
"(3) Three children, $201.
"(4) More than three children, $201, plus $40 for each child in excess of three.".

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 414 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$55" and inserting in lieu thereof "$64".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 414 of such title is amended by striking out "$92" and inserting in lieu thereof "$108".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 414 of such title is amended by striking out "$47" and inserting in lieu thereof "$55".

SEC. 6. Section 337 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "January 31, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1946".

SEC. 7. The first section and sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the basic purpose of this bill is to provide appropriate increases in the rates of compensation payable to service-disabled veterans, including the rates of additional allowances for dependents payable to certain of such veterans and, finally, to increase the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to the widows and children of veterans who have died from service-connected disabilities. This bill was developed after 2 days of open hearings on the compensation programs conducted by our very diligent and capable subcommittee on compensation and pension headed by our most distinguished and longtime former chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE). I wish to commend him and his fellow Members, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the record will clearly demonstrate that our committee has consistently through the years given particular attention to the needs and adequacy of the programs for our service-connected veterans and their survivors. In this connection I think I should point out that while we have endeavored through the years to equate the monthly rates with increases in the cost of living, we have not overlooked the fact that experience has shown that the greater need lies with the more seriously disabled veterans who in many cases are completely unable to supplement their disability compensation payments with outside income. Accordingly, in this bill as in previous measures we have proposed somewhat greater increases on behalf of the severely service-connected disabled veterans.

I should like to note particularly that for many years there has been a modest statutory award payable for the loss of a limb, eye, et cetera, in addition to the basic rate of compensation payable according to the percentage of the disability. This has become known among veterans' groups as the so-called "k" award.

For the first time in over 20 years we have reconsidered this award and granted a 10-percent increase, from $47 to $52, and as I indicated this is payable in addition to the new increased basic rate of compensation in the particular case.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I am proud to be a part of the unanimous committee approval of this very worthwhile legislation. I now feel that it is appropriate to yield such time as he may desire to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, who will explain in more detail the specific provisions of H.R. 14117.

(Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the rates of compensation for service-disabled veterans were last increased on August 1, 1972. Since that time we are all very much aware of the large increase in the cost of living which has caused our committee to give a very high priority to determine the adequacy of this benefit for our disabled veterans. In March the VA recommended an increase of 12 percent